

## Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke

---

The use of physical seeing as a metaphor for spiritual insight is a commonplace in the religious literature of the world<sup>(1)</sup>. The presence of that image in the New Testament writings has long been recognized. All four of the evangelists appear to presume the essential historicity of healing the physically blind as part of Jesus' public ministry. But, as commentators have increasingly recognized, each evangelist seeks to present the accounts of healing from blindness as symbolizing realities that go beyond the physical fact. Mark, for example, pointedly brackets his discipleship section with his two stories of healing from blindness (Mark 8,22-26; 10,46-52). And John, for whom believing is the deepest kind of seeing, portrays Jesus as the light of the world. In his ninth chapter, he has the man born blind act out the story of every Christian coming into the new vision of faith.

What has not been sufficiently noticed is that Luke, too, is clearly aware of the symbolic dimensions of physical seeing. He begins and concludes his two-volume work with Old Testament quotations and allusions which implicitly equate response to the mystery of Jesus with seeing the salvation of God<sup>(2)</sup>. He has his own way of telling and contextualizing the healing of the blind man of Jericho and, throughout the whole of the twin work, special attention is paid to how people "see" Jesus. This has not gone unnoticed in Lucan scholarship<sup>(3)</sup>, but I am not aware of any sustained study of this

(<sup>1</sup>) For some glimpses into this fact, see W. JOHNSTON, *The Inner Eye of Love: Mysticism and Religion* (San Francisco 1978) and R. HAZELTON, "Believing is Seeing: Vision as Metaphor", *TToday* 35 (1979) 405-412.

(<sup>2</sup>) Luke 2,29-32; 3,6; and Acts 28,26-28.

(<sup>3</sup>) Three prime examples of sensitivity to this theme in Luke-Acts are R. DILLON, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (AnBib 82; Rome 1978), R. O'TOOLE, *The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense* (AnBib 78; Rome 1978), and, esp. with regard to Luke's accounts of the call/conversion of Paul, E. SCHILLEBEECKX, *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology* (New York

motif as it is present throughout the whole of Luke-Acts. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that when Luke presents Jesus either as enabler or as object of physical seeing, he does so in a way that symbolizes the deeper seeing which is the faith that perceives Jesus' true identity and acts upon it.

Leaving for subsequent study a discussion of this theme in Acts, this article will focus on the Third Gospel. Part One will consider Luke's special treatment of Jesus' healing of the physically blind, especially as this implements the core of the Isaianic program orchestrated in Luke 4,18; 7,22 (with a glance at 2,29-32 and 3,6); and 18,18-19,10; here the focus is on Jesus as *enabler* of vision. Part Two will focus on Jesus as *object* of vision, surveying first some varieties of false vision and then treating modes of true vision. Part Three will then discuss how the theme of Jesus as enabler and object of vision comes to fulfillment at the close of the Gospel—in the response of the “lookers” under the cross and in the “eye-opening” presence of Jesus on the road to Emmaus.

## I. Jesus as enabler of vision

A. *Sight to the blind: the center of the Isaianic program* (Luke 4,18; 7,22). If Luke is going to thematize the faculty of vision, it will surely show—as it does in the other evangelists—in his treatment of the traditions regarding Jesus' healing of the physically blind. And that, indeed, proves to be the case.

First, the quotation of Isa 61,1-2, applied to the work of Jesus at Luke 4,18, specifies the proclamation of recovery of sight to the blind as part—indeed, the center—of the Isaian scenario. I shall quote that passage here using the RSV version set out in a way that reflects the chiasmic form of Luke 4,16-20 as explicated by R. Meynet following Lund (4):

---

1981) 360-379. P. ACHTEMEIER notes but does not explore the Lucan emphasis on seeing in “And They Followed Him: Miracle and Discipleship in Mark 10,46-52”, *Semeia* 11 (1978) 115-145, esp. 134.

(4) R. MEYNET, *Initiation à la rhétorique biblique* (Paris 1982) 33. Meynet builds on the work of N. LUND, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill 1942) 236-238.

- A And he *stood up* to read  
 B And there *was given* to him the book of the prophet Isaiah  
 C He *opened the book* and found the place where it was written  
 D "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me  
 E *to proclaim good news* to the poor.  
 F He *has sent me* to proclaim release *to captives*  
 G and recovering of sight to the blind, [*kai typhlois anablepsin*]  
 F' *to set at liberty* those who are oppressed,  
 E' *to proclaim*  
 D' the acceptable year of the Lord".  
 C' And he *closed the book*,  
 B' and *gave it back* to the attendant,  
 A' and *sat down*.

Note that the Isaian quotation comprises a seven-member chiasm (D-E-F-G-F'-E'-D'), which is itself the center of a narrative framework organized chiastically (A-B-C . . . C'-B'-A'). This careful literary structure is a clear signal that the material is under the full control of the author. Further, commentators are alert to point out that the reference to setting free the oppressed (4,18c) is imported to this place from Isa 58,6, thereby indicating the literary interest of Luke (or his tradition) rather than the literal record of Jesus' synagogue reading<sup>(5)</sup>. Since Isa 61,1c already speaks of proclaiming "release to captives", the question arises, Why, then, import Isa 58,6c—"to let the oppressed go free"? The answer may lie in the chiastic design: Luke enlisted Isa 58,6c precisely because it echoed Isa 61,1c and provided the parallel he needed<sup>(6)</sup>. Most important for our study is what stands at the center of this careful construction: *kai typhlois anablepsin* ("and recovering of sight to the blind")<sup>(7)</sup>.

<sup>(5)</sup> E.g., A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1922) 120-122 and J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke, I-IX* (AB; Garden City 1977) 532.

<sup>(6)</sup> This editing to achieve chiastic balance may also account for the omission of the reference to "healing the broken-hearted" in Isa 61,1c. It is a detail which is surely in harmony with Luke's themes, but here its inclusion would overload one side of the chiasm. LUND, *Chiasmus*, 237-238, also observes this.

<sup>(7)</sup> The reference to proclaiming *anablepsis* to the blind is lacking here in the Hebrew (but see Isa 29,18 and 35,6) and available only in the LXX—another indication that what we have here is the Greek version serving Luke's intention rather than the Hebrew version serving Jesus' oral purpose.

Luke 7,18-29 appears to provide a partial commentary on this passage. When the embassy from John the Baptist inquires whether Jesus is the Coming One, Luke apparently adds to the "Q" tradition (cf. Matt 11,2-3) verse 21, a summary statement of Jesus' healing ministry concluding with the words, "and he gave sight [*echarisato blepein*] to many blind people". The reason for this addition would seem to be that he is about to introduce the listing of end-time healings and he has not yet narrated a cure from blindness. The uses of *charizomai* here—"to give freely or graciously as a favor"<sup>(8)</sup>, a word used elsewhere in the gospels only at Luke 7,42-43, where it denotes a generous cancellation of debt—aptly reflects the Jubilee spirit of the benefactions of the proclamation of Isa 61,1-2 at Luke 4,18.

After Jesus' instruction, in 7,22, that the Baptist's messengers announce to their master what they have seen and heard, there follows the cluster of healing references drawn from Isa 61,1 LXX (blind, poor); 35,6 (blind, deaf, lame); and 29,18 (blind, deaf, poor). Thus, in answer to the question whether he is the Coming One, Jesus points to his healing ministry and describes it by way of allusions to the Isaianic visions of the end-time. The implication appears to be this: if the end-time healings are happening, they must draw their own conclusions about Jesus' identity as the end-time agent—*ho erchomenos*<sup>(9)</sup>. Among the clues, the healing of blindness

---

Here, however, the difference between the LXX and the MT derives not from interpolation but from the LXX, which makes specific what the MT puts more vaguely. As FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 532, observes: "The LXX follows the MT for the most part, but the meaning of the Hebrew text of 61:1d is disputed (lit. "for those bound an opening"—but in what sense?). The LXX understood it as an opening of eyes".

(<sup>8</sup>) W. BAUER, W. ARNDT, F. GINGRICH, and F. DANKER, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (London 1979) 876-877.

(<sup>9</sup>) FITZMYER, *Luke, I-IX*, 672, suggests that John the Baptist thought of Jesus as *Elias redivivus*, the "One who is to come" in the role of the fiery reformer. However, the earlier observation of J. JEREMIAS, "*Êljeias*", *TDNT* 2 (1964) 1936, still seems valid: "it certainly cannot be shown that he [John the Baptist] thought of himself as the forerunner of Elijah. Quite apart from the fact that the forerunner of the forerunner is an *ad hoc* invention, the description which the Baptist gives of the *erchomenos* does not fit the returning of Elijah, who is nowhere expected as the One who baptizes with the Spirit (Mk 1:8 and par.) or as the Judge (Mt 3:12 and par.)".



has, at least in the presentation of Luke, pride of place. Such healing was named last in the summary of v. 21, and it is immediately repeated as first in the cluster of v. 22.

The full narratives of healing—the blind beggar near Jericho (Luke 18,35-43) and the temporarily blinded Saul (Acts 9,8-19)—will provide Luke with further opportunity for relating physical cures from blindness to his theme of Jesus as enabler and object of true seeing. At this point, it is enough to observe that Jesus' activity of healing from physical blindness points to him, for those who have eyes to see, as the end-time One Who is to Come. Luke 7,22, then, contributes to the symbolic use of vision in Luke in two ways: (1) it suggests that truly to "see" Jesus' healing works is to discern them as the work of the eschatological agent; and (2) among those healings, the cure of the blind is highlighted, apparently because of their literal exemplification of LXX Isa 61,1 (*kēryxai... typhlois anablepsin*).

B. *More Isaian imagery in the prelude: light for the Gentiles, salvation visible* (Luke 2,29-32; 3,6). Once our study of 4,18 and 7,22 has heightened our awareness of Luke's interest in the image of physical vision, two earlier Lucan uses of Isaiah take on fresh luster—2,29-32 and 3,6.

At the presentation in the temple, Simeon takes the infant Jesus in his arms and prays the *Nunc Dimittis* (2,29-32), a celebration of Jesus entirely in terms of vision. That the epithets "salvation" (*sōtērion*), "light" (*phōs*), and "glory" (*doxa*) refer to Jesus is clear not only from the dramatic context but also from v. 26, which states that Simeon had been assured by the Holy Spirit that he would not see death until he had seen the Anointed of the Lord. In having Simeon celebrate Jesus in these terms, Luke has the old man see in the child an identity which will not become evident until the unfolding of volume two of the story. For Jesus will not fulfill the Isaianic hope of being a light to the Gentiles (Isa 42,6; 49,6) until he is risen and preaching through his church (see Acts 13,47 and 26,18,23).

In the following chapter, Luke's introduction to the Baptist's preaching, the motif of seeing the salvation of God is echoed again at 3,6, in the extended quotation of Isa 40,3-5 (where the citation of vv. 4 and 5 are unique to Luke within the triple tradition)—"and all flesh shall see the salvation of God".

C. *Three blind men: the rich ruler, the Jericho beggar, and Zachaeus* (18,18-19,10). André Paul<sup>(10)</sup> has explicated well both Luke's retelling of the Marcan account and his "re-setting" of that story within the context of the journey narrative. Bartimaeus becomes nameless. Instead of jumping up, he must be led. The address *Rabbouni* becomes the title *Kyrie*. The imperative of Jesus is no longer "Go!" but "See!". Luke heightens the reversal of roles occurring in the story: At first a *crowd* informs a *blind man* about the presence of *Jesus of Nazareth*. At the end, the man *sees* miraculously and glorifies God and all the *people*, in their turn, "give praise to God". The crowd has received revelation from the blind man who had identified Jesus as "Lord" (v. 41). The hostile "crowd" has changed into "the people" who praise God<sup>(11)</sup>.

In his elaboration of the chiasmic shape of Luke's version of this story, R. Meynet<sup>(12)</sup> has further clarified how Luke's retelling has given new emphases and heightened the symmetry of Mark's account. Apparently independently of A. Paul's work, Meynet observes the same reversal of roles, adding these nuances: the blind man has progressed from "begging" to "giving", from hearing to seeing, and from sitting to following. The chiasmic center of Luke's account is the man's cry, "Son of David, have pity on me". Meynet notes, as well, some internal contrasts: The crowd calls Jesus simply "the Nazorean"; the blind man identifies him as "Son of David". The crowd tries to quiet the man; Jesus invites him over. The blind man resists the crowd but obeys Jesus. Without seeing physically, the beggar recognizes in Jesus the Son of David, the savior, and the presence of God. This is the faith which opens his eyes and frees his feet to follow. Like the movement of the psalms of supplication—i.e., from supplication to praise—the faith of the supplicant meets the love (mercy) of God in Jesus. It is an illustration of the final verse of the Benedictus—"to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace" (1,79)<sup>(13)</sup>. Thus, the story's motif of discipleship, so evi-

(10) A. PAUL, "La guérison de l'aveugle (des aveugles) de Jéricho", *Foi et Vie* (Cahier biblique 9) 69.3 (1970) 44-69, esp. 55-59.

(11) Ibid., 56-58.

(12) R. MEYNET, "Au cœur du texte: analyse rhétorique de l'aveugle de Jéricho selon saint Luc", *NRT* 103 (1981) 696-710.

(13) Ibid., 697-706.

dent in Mark, is not lost in Luke's retelling. The true disciple is one who "sees" who Jesus really is and is thereby enabled to follow.

But, as A. Paul has also pointed out, it is the larger context of Luke's editing—his placement of the story within his version of the central journey narrative—that best reveals Luke's creative emphasis. Luke appears to have in mind a different kind of spiritual blindness.

Note what has happened in Luke's remodeling of Mark's story line. The Bartimaeus met in Mark as Jesus leaves Jericho becomes, in Luke, a *nameless* beggar met by Jesus as he *approaches* Jericho. Those changes point to what follows immediately in Jericho—the encounter with Zacchaeus. The comparison invited by this arrangement yields some striking similarities: like the nameless blind man, Zacchaeus is, at first, unable to see Jesus (19,3), experiences the murmuring of the crowd (19,7; cf. 18,39), remains resolute in his quest (19,8; cf. 18,40), and is finally transformed through faith in the Jesus he acknowledges as Lord (19,8; cf. 18,41)<sup>(14)</sup>. It may be that Luke suppressed the name of the blind man and placed him on the way into Jericho because he really is, in a sense, Zacchaeus, inasmuch as his "faith healing" from blindness illustrates precisely what is to happen to Zacchaeus, whose whole effort is, after all, "to see Jesus, who he is" (*ezētei idein ton Iēsoun tis estin*)<sup>(15)</sup>.

How Luke arranges the material preceding the account of the blind beggar is as illuminating as what follows it. A comparison with the Marcan context of the Bartimaeus account reveals a remarkable set of omissions and postponements at this point. Luke omits entirely the embarrassing exchange between the Zebedees and Jesus (Mark 10,35-37); he bypasses the word about baptism (Mark 10,38-40; a similar saying interpreting his ministry as baptism has already occurred at Luke 12,50); and he postpones until the supper (22,24-27) the dispute among the disciples and Jesus' word about true greatness and authority (Mark 10,41-47). The net effect of this editorial arrangement is to bring into close juxtaposition four elements: (1) the dialogue with the rich ruler (Luke 18,18-30), (2) a

<sup>(14)</sup> That the *kyrie* on the lips of Zacchaeus in v. 8 means more than "Sir" is suggested by its proximity to the christological use of that word in the introductory phrase of the same verse, *eipen prós ton kyrion*.

<sup>(15)</sup> These details from PAUL, "La guérison", 57-58.

passion prediction (18,31-34), (3) the healing of the blind beggar near Jericho (18,35-43), and (4) the conversion of Zacchaeus (19,1-10). Since we are learning to see that Luke gives us no mere scrapbook of fragments but a coherent narrative in which most episodes are illuminated by their surrounding context, the arrangement of the material in 18,18-19,10 must be taken as more than casual.

We have already explored the parallelism between the blind man and Zacchaeus. Does Luke also invite comparison between the rich ruler and Zacchaeus? There are some indications that he does: the two figures are, first of all, relatively close in the flow of the narrative; Luke makes the man of 18,18-24 similar to Zacchaeus by explicitly calling him *plousios* (18,23; cf. 19,1; Mark says that he "had great possessions") and by highlighting his social role (he is a "ruler", *archōn* [18,18], just as Zacchaeus is no mere *telōnēs* but an *architelōnēs* [19,1]). Further, he intensifies the encounter between Jesus and the rich ruler by having Jesus speak the eye-of-the-needle saying in his presence (cf. Luke 18,23-24 with Mark 10,22-23, where Jesus speaks the word to his disciples after the man goes away sad). Once the comparison is established, the contrasts are even more significant. The rich ruler of 18,18-30 and Zacchaeus both need to be cured of a kind of blindness associated with their wealth. The rich ruler, however, can only acknowledge Jesus as "good master", cling to his property, and grow sad, whereas Zacchaeus receives Jesus with joy, calls him "Lord", and resolves to give half his goods to the poor<sup>(16)</sup>. What we have here, then, is a kind of narrative triptych, with the center panel being the story of a literal cure of a blind man, and the two wing panels being the stories of two men blinded by their riches, one of whom, the rich ruler, is not freed by his encounter with Jesus, and the other, Zacchaeus, who is open to the gift of salvation (19,9).

<sup>(16)</sup> These last two items are noted by PAUL, "La guérison", 59. J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke. X-XXIV* (AB; Garden City 1985) 1220-21, and 1224-25, argues that *didōmi* of v. 8 expresses customary behavior rather than a decision regarding future action. But this interpretation leaves unexplained how one can habitually (i.e. repeatedly) divest oneself of half of one's property and also in what sense a Zacchaeus who needs no repentance can be an example of "the lost" whom the Son of Man came to seek (19,10). On this question, see I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter 1978) 697-698.

As a kind of hinge between the first and second panels of the triptych, Luke includes the third passion prediction (18,31-34; par. Mark 10,32-34). But, instead of making the disciples' failure to understand a culpable blindness (as it is in the Marcan account, demonstrated narratively by the Zebedee brothers' request for a share in his glory), Luke says simply that the meaning of the words was "hidden" (*kekrymmenon*) from them. The understanding that the Christ must suffer is a light that will come with the dawning of Easter. This will be elaborated in Luke's narrative of Calvary and Emmaus<sup>(17)</sup>. Meanwhile, the blindness to true discipleship which informs this triptych is the attachment to material goods. This theme is, of course, already in the tradition as Mark transmits it (see the same conjunction of the rich man and the discourse on riches and the rewards of discipleship in Mark 10,17-31), but a new emphasis is achieved through the Lucan shift by which the blindness cure and the Zacchaeus pericope are "attracted" to this complex of material on riches and discipleship. Regarding our study of the metaphor of vision in Luke, perhaps the most important point is that Zacchaeus' transformation from spiritual blindness begins with his search to "see Jesus, who he is" (19,3)<sup>(18)</sup>.

## II. Jesus as the object of vision (false and true)

In our survey of passages presenting Jesus as enabler of vision, we also found him to come into focus as object of vision—i.e., in the Zacchaeus account. We turn now to some texts which focus even more explicitly on Jesus as object of vision, some of it false and some of it true. (Even in these passages, the object of vision will often be the enabler.)

A. *False seeing: the blindness of Israel's leaders.* As a kind of foil to the authentic vision of those who perceive Jesus the healer

<sup>(17)</sup> Note that it is precisely this passion prediction, with its uniquely Lucan reference to the fulfillment of "everything written in the prophets about the Son of Man", which is referred to at Luke 24,44.

<sup>(18)</sup> This story of spontaneous tree climbing and ingenuous hospitality is a vivid illustration of what it means to "receive the kingdom of God like a child" (Luke 18,17)—words occurring in Luke's narrative just after the parable of the Pharisee and the repentant tax collector and just before the story of the rich ruler.

correctly, Luke presents the failure of Israel's leaders, especially Herod and the Pharisees, to see Jesus aright.

1. *Herod (9,9)*. The first of the leaders whom Luke presents as seeing in a way that fails to understand is Herod Agrippa I. In a verse special to Luke (9,9), the king is described as trying to see Jesus (*ezētei idein auton*). In the synoptic parallels, Mark 6,16 and Matt 14,1-2, Herod, thinking Jesus to be John the Baptist *redivivus*, expresses no interest in seeing him. But Luke is setting the reader up for a future encounter between Jesus and Herod, at 23,8-9: "Herod was very pleased when he saw Jesus, for he had heard about him and had been wanting to see him for a long time [*thelōn idein auton*]: he was hoping to see him perform some sign". Compare with Zacchaeus, who desired not simply to see Jesus but to see *who* he is (*tis estin*). Herod falls rather into the class, along with the Pharisees, of those who sought a sign (see 11,16).

2. *The lamp of the body (Luke 11,34-36)*. Because of his use of the logion, the dominical saying about the eye as lamp of body (Luke 11,34-36; par. Matt 6,22-24) calls for treatment under the topic of blind leadership. Curiously Matthew's context for these sayings—in the midst of and apparently illustrating the surrounding sayings against storing treasure on earth and serving mammon—would be very appropriate to Luke. But Luke's context suggests that for him the sound eye is the one which correctly perceives Jesus, for the section just before this one contains Jesus' words excoriating "this evil generation" which has failed to perceive and respond to the one greater than Jonah (11,29-31)<sup>(19)</sup>. Indeed, the whole of 11,14-53 (from Jesus and Beelzebul through the denouncing of the Pharisees and lawyers) is unified by critique of an Israel, especially as personified in its leadership, which fails to hear and see Jesus properly. Under Luke's hand, the mute (*kōphos*) demoniac and the parable of the exorcised man retaken by seven demons illustrate the unseeing and unhearing Israel, whereas Mary (blessed as one of those who hear the word of God and do it, 11,27-28), the Ninevites, and the

<sup>(19)</sup> J. JEREMIAS, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York 1963) 163, makes a similar point. He translates *to phōs to en soi* as "inner light". He comments, "If Mt 6.22f, and par Lk 11.34-36, is not warning against covetousness but rather against inner blindness, then Luke is right in recording the saying as addressed to the crowd with reference to Jesus' opponents. To be blind means to be hardened. You are hardened. What fearful darkness".

Queen of the South are presented as counterexamples—those who heard and perceived God's reality.

3. *Hypocritical "blindness"*. At Luke 12,56, Jesus addressed the multitude: "You hypocrites! You know how to interpret the appearance of the earth and sky; but why do you not know how to interpret the present time?" The people are accused of a kind of blindness here. What sign of the present time are they failing to see properly? Luke's arrangement of the material in the immediate context suggests that he understands the unread sign to be Jesus himself, for the material immediately preceding contains words of self-identification by Jesus—"I have come to cast fire on the earth..." (12,49-53). And these words introduce an editorial unit (12,49-13,35) which terminates in the lament over Jerusalem (13,31-35) and which also contains dominical sayings about Jesus' identity and Jerusalem's failure to see him as a sign of the present time. It would seem, then, that the blindness with which the multitudes are charged in 12,56 is a failure to perceive correctly (and respond appropriately to) the person of Jesus<sup>(20)</sup>.

4. *The "spying out" of the Pharisees*. Part of this theme of the blindness of Israel's leadership is expressed by means of a specific word Luke uses to describe the "spying out" indulged in by the Pharisees with respect to Jesus. It is a special kind of non-seeing and the word chosen to name it, *paratēreō*, is richly suggestive. *Paratēreō* occurs six times in the NT. Except for Gal 4,10, where it refers to observing days and months, it has to do with the malevolent watching of enemies: Mark, 3,1, par.; Luke 6,7 (leaders watching Jesus to catch him healing the man with the withered hand on the sabbath); Luke 14,1 (the same kind of spying out by the Pharisees, on the occasion of Jesus' healing of the man with dropsy); Luke 20,20 (the scribes and the high priests watching for the right time to hire men to trap Jesus in his words); and Acts 9,24 (where it refers to the vigilante group watching at the Damascus gate to kill Paul). The Septuagint use of *paratēreō* supports the sinister connotations of this word: it turns up there 6 times. See especially Dan 6,11 (where Daniel's administrative peers spy out his disobedience of

(<sup>20</sup>) Luke uses *hypokritai* two others times in Luke-Acts—at Luke 6,42 and in the middle of the present section, 13,15. Note that those called hypocrites in 6,42 are the blind leaders who fail to see the log in their own eye.

the new law against prayer), Dan. Su. 12.15.16 (the corrupt judges' watching to ravish Susanna), and, most striking of all as a possible background to Luke's use with respect to the leaders, LXX Ps 36,12 (*paratērēsetai ho hamartolos ton dikaion*).

This scrutiny of *paratēreō* bears exegetical fruit when we encounter its single NT use as a noun at Luke 17,20. In answer to the Pharisees' question about when the Reign of God would come, Jesus answers, "The Reign of God does not come *meta paratērēseōs*. This last phrase is rendered variously in English: "with signs to be observed" (RSV), "you cannot tell by careful watching" (NAB), "with observation" (BAG), "you cannot tell by observation" (NEB). I suggest that the usual translations of *meta paratērēseōs* miss the ironic punch of the Greek word. Given the sinister meaning attached to the verbal form of that word in Luke-Acts (and in the LXX), *paratērēsis* carries the connotation of the defensive scrutiny of those who seek to manipulate. A paraphrase of 17,20, then, might go like this: The kingdom of God is not perceivable to those who would try to "check it out" in an uncommitted way.

The next words of Jesus, 17,21, expand on v. 20, and suggest where the Reign of God is to be perceived: "Nor will they say, 'Look, here it is', or 'there', for the Reign of God is in your midst". Verses 20 and 21, then, set up a contrast between how the kingdom is not to be perceived (*meta paratērēseōs*, or in a way that it can be localized by pointing here or there) and how it is truly present (*entos hymōn*). If we seek in Luke's text for a clue to his understanding of that contrast between not seeing and seeing the Reign of God, the story immediately preceding, the healing of the lepers, may well provide the answer. For here too, as we shall see later in more detail, we have a contrast between those who do not really perceive what has happened to them (the nine who failed to return) and the one who saw in such a way that it can be said that his faith saved him. What the Samaritan leper "saw", as he demonstrates by returning to Jesus to praise God, is that the person of Jesus is now the "place" to praise God. When we allow these two adjacent pericopes to interpret one another, they suggest that the Reign of God is *entos hymōn* in the person and action of Jesus. The Samaritan sees what the Pharisees (and those afflicted with such blindness among the Lucan readership) fail to see<sup>(21)</sup>.

(21) In the discourse to the disciples which follows (17,22-25), Luke takes



B. *True seeing*1. *The response to the healing of the paralytic (5,26).*

On the occasion of the healing of the paralytic, the response of the crowd is described by each synoptist in his own way. Luke's version has a peculiar apocalyptic intensity: "And amazement seized them all and they glorified God and were filled with awe, saying, 'We have seen strange things today [*eidomen paradoxa sēmeron*]' " (5-26b). Within the context of the Third Gospel, the word *sēmeron* here associates this choral response with the other "today" sayings of Luke which proclaim the presence of salvation—2,11; 4,21; 13,32-33; 19,5.9; and 23,43. Again, what is "seen" is not simply a marvel but a sign. This response is one in a series in which groups respond to what they see in the person of Jesus. It is, as we shall see, a series which climaxes under the cross.

2. *Apostolic "seeing" (Luke 10,23-24).* "Blessed are the eyes which see what you see! For I tell you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it". This "Q" saying, which Matthew places, along with the Isa 6,9-10 quotation, in his parables chapter (Matt 13), Luke puts in the context of the ministry of the seventy-two. Whatever the relationship between Matthew and Luke, comparison with the Matthean context highlights Luke's concern. In the Lucan context, what the eyes of the disciples have seen are the effects of their healing ministry done in Jesus' name: "Lord, even the demons obeyed as we commanded them in your name" (10,17). The revelation of the Father by the Son (10,22) is in Luke brought in closer connection with the healing ministry than it apparently had in its "Q" context: compare Luke's *en autē tē horq ēgalliasato* (10,21) with Matthew's *en ekeinō tō kairō* . . . (11,25). It is clear that the "seeing" for which the eyes of the disciples are blessed is not

---

up a question of the community which is allied with but not identical to the question put in the mouth of the Pharisees. Luke treats here, cheek by jowl, two different kinds of eschatological material—(1) the presence of the Reign of God in the person and work of Jesus (17,20-21, in the light of 17,11-19) and (2) the coming revelation of the Son of Man, the "day" which will mark the end of the end-time (17,22-35). The one can be "seen" with the eye of faith (as demonstrated by the healed Samaritan); the other will not be visible in any sense—except after the fact, like the lightning or the dead body signaled by vultures.

simply the seeing of the external phenomena of the exorcism (10,17) and the providential protection against snakes, scorpions, and the power of the Enemy (10,19). More important is their having been shown, in that experience of the mission, their relationship to the Father and the Son (10,20-22). The experience of the mission in Jesus' name has in effect been a "seeing" of Jesus himself.

3. *What the healed Samaritan sees (Luke 17,15).* This dimension of seeing beyond the surface of Christian healing is spelled out perhaps most fully in the healing of the Samaritan leper and the accompanying dialogue (17,11-19). All ten lepers were cured. It is only to the returning Samaritan leper that Jesus says, "Your faith has saved (healed) you". When we look for the added ingredient that renders the behavior of the Samaritan a faith that saves, we find it acted out in the preceding verses, precisely in terms of seeing and consequent response. "One of them, seeing that he was healed *idōn hoti iathē* came back, praising God with a loud voice...". W. Bruners<sup>(22)</sup> has made a good case that this pericope is a Lucan construction based on 2 Kgs 5,1-19 and on the traditions of Jesus' healing of lepers. He finds it an "imitative prophet story", written to present Jesus acting in a way that both imitates and surpasses the prophet Elisha. The story is similar to 2 Kgs 5,1-19 in at least seven ways but then transcends it in that, unlike Elisha, Jesus is addressed in the biblical mode for addressing God, heals with a command, and accepts the thanks.

When the details of the narrative are allowed to speak symbolically, as the story itself urges, then the point would seem to be that Jesus (not the temple) has become, for the believer, the proper locus for thanking and worshipping God. That this vision of faith—not merely gratitude—is the theme of the story is borne out by the Lucan context. In Luke 17,5-10, the saying about the uprooted sycamore illustrates that the "smallest" faith is of immeasurable power; the parable of the unworthy servant teaches that faith consists in one's relationship with the master, a relationship in no way earned.

(22) W. BRUNERS, *Die Reinigung der Zehn Aussätzigen und die Heilung des Samariters, Lk 17.11-19* (Stuttgart 1977). For a more detailed summary, see my review in *CBQ* 41 (1979) 151-153. H. D. BETZ, "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers [Luke 17:11-19]", *JBL* 10 (1971) 314-328, rightly insists that the "seeing" is more important than the healing and that physical healing here is not identical with salvation (315, 318, and 325).

These same themes, the quality of faith and acknowledging a gifted relationship, are acted out in Luke 17,11-19. And, as we discussed above, in the context immediately following the healing of the lepers—the Pharisees' question about when the Reign of God will come and Jesus' answer (Luke 17,20-21)—these verses elaborate (in visual terms, let it be noted) what was already present in vv. 15-16. The Pharisees miss what the healed Samaritan sees—that the Reign of God is present in the action and person of Jesus.

4. *The lament over and the entry into Jerusalem (13,34-35 and 19,37-38).* The lament over Jerusalem concludes with the words, "You shall not see me until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord'". To understand how Luke intends this reference to seeing Jesus, it is important to read it in the Third Evangelist's own setting and not to be confused by our memory of Matthew's version. For in the Matthean context, that lament is spoken in Jerusalem, *after* the words "Blessed is he who comes..." have been spoken during the entry into the city. In Matthew's story line, therefore, it would seem that the words ("you will not see me *again* until...", Matt 23,39) apply to the parousia.

In Luke's story line, however, the words ("you will not see me until the time comes when you say, 'Blessed is he...'", Luke 13,35) will be fulfilled, not in the parousia but on the occasion of the entry, 19,37-38, when it is said that "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works they had seen [*peri pasin hōn eidōn dynameōn*], saying, 'Blessed is the King who comes in the name of the Lord!'. Notice that they are responding to the *dynameis* (the works of power—i.e., in the context of the Gospel, primarily the healings). The response, spoken in a "loud voice" like that of the Samaritan leper, points to a "seeing" that recognizes the works as done by God in Jesus, hailed as the "king who comes in the name of the Lord". Just as in 13,34-35, the context involves a warning from the Pharisees (19,39; cf. 13,31) and a lament over unperceiving Jerusalem (19,42-44; cf. 13,43-44). To "see" Jesus in 13,35, then, means to perceive him as do the disciples of 19,37-38, who see him as a nonpolitical king whose reign is evidenced in his healing and who comes in the name of the Lord<sup>(23)</sup>.

(23) This theme of Israel's leadership as blind (and deaf) is portrayed in

### III. Fulfillment: Vision at Calvary and Emmaus

A. *Calvary: seeing the hanged healer.* Each of the evangelists shows a concern for highlighting the crucified Jesus as a spectacle eliciting a variety of responses<sup>(24)</sup>. But Luke shows an even greater interest in the ways of watching under the cross, where he presents his climactic choral response of people seeing in various ways Jesus the healer. In each of the synoptic gospels, Jesus is taunted, ironically, as the hanged healer, the one who saved others but cannot save<sup>(25)</sup> himself (Mark 15,31; Matt 27,42; Luke 23,35). It is significant, though, how Luke orchestrates the ways of viewing and modes of responding among those gathered under the cross. Where Mark places the first taunt ("Aha! You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself, and come down from the cross!" Mark 15,29-30) on the lips of passers-by who, in a phrase alluding to Ps 22,7, are said to be wagging their heads, Luke chooses another phrase from the same verse of that psalm to speak more neutrally of the *people* standing there *looking* (*theōrōn*; Ps 21,8 LXX) while the leaders mock<sup>(26)</sup>.

Unlike both Mark and Matthew, Luke speaks of no mere passers-by (cf. Mark 15,29; Matt 27,39) or casual bystanders (cf. Mark 15,35; Matt 27,47). He writes, rather, of people who have come precisely to see and observe—*ho laos theōrōn* (Luke 23,34). And after the death of Jesus and the response of the centurion (who in

---

the culmination of Stephen's speech, where he excoriates the Sanhedrin for being uncircumcised of heart and ear especially in their failure to respond to Jesus (Acts 7,51-53). And when he sees the vision of the Son of man and cries "Look!", they stop up their ears (vv. 56-57).

(<sup>24</sup>) Mark 15,32a ("Let the Christ the king of Israel come down from the cross that we may see [*hin idōmen*] and believe"), Mark 15,39 (the centurion, *idōn*) and v. 40 (the women, *ēsan... theōrousaī*), Matt 27,54 (the centurion and those watching with him, seeing the seismic disturbances), Matt 27,55 (the many women *theōrousaī*), John 19,33-37 (the soldiers seeing that Jesus was already dead; the eye-witness testimony of the flow of water and blood; and the quotation of Zech 12,10).

(<sup>25</sup>) *Sōzein*, used throughout the gospels both for healing and rescuing.

(<sup>26</sup>) While the mere use of *theōreō* is not sufficient to establish it as an allusion to the Psalm, its conjunction with *ekmyktērīzō* makes the allusion quite probable.

Luke echoes the response of witnesses to the healing ministry of Jesus by "glorifying God"), "all the crowds who had gathered there for the sight (*theōrian*, "spectacle"), seeing what had happened, returned beating their breasts [*pantes hoi symparagenomenoi ochloi epi tēn theōrian tautēn, theōrēsantes ta genomena, typtontes ta stēthē hypostrephon*]" (23,48)<sup>(27)</sup>.

There are clues here to suggest that Luke would have the reader see this response of the crowds of spectators as paradigmatic of conversion. The crowds, after all, are those who had called out for Jesus' crucifixion (Luke 23,13,18) and the rare participle used to describe them here (*symparagenomenoi*, a hapax in the NT) is used only once in the OT (LXX Ps 82,9), to describe a hostile gathering of God's enemies. Their response to the sight they have assembled to see (returning penitentially beating their breasts) recalls the same action of the repentant tax collector (Luke 18,13), who went home justified<sup>(28)</sup>. What they respond to in the sight of the hanged healer is more than what meets the physical eye<sup>(29)</sup>. The end of the Gospel will spell this out.

(27) What MARSHALL, *Gospel of Luke*, 876, refers to as "an awkward repetition" of the root in *theōrēsantes* is, in the light of Luke's "vision" theme, quite probably a deliberate emphasis.

(28) Another place where *hypostrephō* may be intended to have a secondary, symbolic meaning of conversion is the return of the healed Samaritan leper (17,15,18). E. SCHWEIZER, *The Good News According to Luke* (Atlanta 1984) 362, is sensitive to the words for "seeing" under the cross and for "returning". He observes that the words used in 23,47-48 —*idōn* and *theōrēsantes*— are used in John 16,19 to distinguish outward seeing from spiritual seeing but he holds that "the real return will not be possible until Acts 2,37-38". It may well be that the "returning" of Luke 23,47 is meant to forecast precisely that fuller conversion.

(29) The importance of the perspective of the cross for correctly perceiving Jesus the healer has already been prepared for by Luke's setting of the second passion prediction, 9,43b-45. After saying that all the people respond to the healing of the boy with the unclean spirit by being astonished at the majesty of God (9,43a), Luke goes on to have Jesus confront the disciples as the people were marveling at everything he was doing (apparently, as in 19,37-38, to be taken as a response to his ministry in general). In the face of that adulation, the second passion prediction is uttered, with the reference to resurrection strikingly absent: "'Let these words sink into your ears; for the Son of Man is to be delivered into the hands of men'. But they did not understand this saying, and it was concealed [*parakekalymenon*] from them

B. *Emmaus: the final eye-opening.* Luke's references to "seeing" Jesus in his final chapter are central to the narrative and highly nuanced. When the risen Lord, whom Luke here calls simply "Jesus himself" (*autos Iēsous*), joins the two on the road to Emmaus, it is said that "their eyes were kept from recognizing him". Since the narrative shows them treating Jesus as an ordinary stranger, and not as a disembodied voice or a heavenly apparition, the reference to their eyes being kept from recognizing him refers, on the face of it, not to a lapse of physical eyesight but to that inner kind of seeing called recognition. After Jesus takes, blesses, breaks, and shares the bread with them, it is said that their eyes are opened, they recognize him, and he becomes (physically) invisible to them. This restraining of eyes in v. 16 and the opening of eyes in v. 31 is clearly a metaphor for understanding. That the passive voice is a "divine passive"<sup>(30)</sup>, suggesting that the restraining and opening is the action of God, is confirmed in v. 35, where an unusual passive is used to describe the same event—*egnōsthē autois en tē klasei tou artou*. A superficial reading (or hearing) of the story might understand the restraining and opening of eyes as indicating a physical change of Jesus' appearance amounting to a kind of disguise, which would make the recognition merely seeing through a mistaken identity. And on one level this may be true<sup>(31)</sup>, the level on which the eleven are invited to look at Jesus' hands and feet and see that it is truly he (24,39). But Luke's use of *dianoigō* points to a still deeper kind of seeing. What had happened on the road (*ta en tē hodō*, v. 35) was that Jesus had explained to them what was said about him in the Scriptures, how the Christ must die and thus enter into his glory (24,25-27).

---

that they could not perceive it, and they were afraid to ask him about this saying" (9,44-45). By this presentation of his stark version of the second passion prediction, Luke seems to be implying that the healing wonders of Jesus will only be properly understood when unveiled in the light of the death of Jesus, when Jesus is understood, in the paradox of faith, as the hanged healer.

<sup>(30)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke, X-XXIV*, 1563, n. 16, and 1568, n. 31, also sees the "theological passive" here. So too MARSHALL, *Gospel of Luke*, 893, 898. SCHWEIZER, *Luke*, 370, however, understands "disbelief" here as the hindrance to seeing.

<sup>(31)</sup> DILLON, *From Eye-Witnesses*, 146, observes rightly that the description of Jesus appearing *en hetera morphē* in the Marcan appendix (Mark 16,12) is an emphasis not found in Luke 24.

After the recognition moment, the two say, "Were not our hearts burning when he spoke to us on the road as he opened [*diēnoigen*] the Scriptures to us?" The recognition, then, is tied in with understanding the Scriptures. This is confirmed later in the appearance to the eleven, when Jesus is said to open their minds (*diēnoixen auton ton noun*, v. 45) to understand the Scriptures. It is *one* step, then, for the disciples to see that the risen One is the Jesus who was crucified. But it is a further step—a deeper opening of vision—for them to recognize him as the Christ of Scripture who must suffer and thus enter into his glory. This, for Luke, is truly to see Jesus as he is<sup>(32)</sup>.

#### IV. Conclusion

Jesus comes to announce and inaugurate the Reign of God by healing and revealing, especially as the Risen One who had to die. Luke affirms this connection between healing and revealing, especially in his presentation of Jesus as the one who proclaims sight to the blind.

Both the readers of the Gospel and those who encounter Jesus in its narrative are led through an itinerary of deepening visions regarding the true identity of Jesus.

(1) His prophetic ministry of eye-opening revelation is first announced by means of images from Isaiah (Isa 49,6 at Luke 2,32; Isa 40,3-5 at Luke 3,4-6; Isa 61,1 at Luke 4,18; Isa 61,1 and 29,18 at Luke 7,22).

(2) Luke's version of the healing of the blind beggar outside of Jericho is key. The beggar's very anonymity allows the story to become the story of every Christian. More alert than the crowd to

<sup>(32)</sup>I found these observations confirmed by DILLON, *From Eye-Witnesses*, 133, who finds in the passives of Luke 9,45; 18,34; and 24,16 indication of "a purposeful schedule of concealment and disclosure, divinely appointed". He also (on p. 217) describes the process of Luke's Easter story as a movement from observable fact to divine revelation: "Rescued from the dullness of their human senses by the divine word, and experiencing thus the gift of Easter, the 'eye-witnesses' become 'ministers of the word' (Lk 1:2). Luke's Easter story is, in fact, the story of that 'becoming'".

the identity of Jesus, the blind man “sees” the Son of David in Jesus the Nazorean. Called by Jesus personally, he is enabled to know him as *Kyrie*. With that, Jesus gives the man the full vision which allows him to follow—praising God and prompting others to do the same.

(3) Luke’s placement of the healing of this blind man between the accounts of the encounters with the rich ruler, on the one hand, and the head tax collector, on the other, illuminates what happens in each of these meetings. Unlike the blind man, the ruler, blinded by his attachment to wealth, never moves beyond seeing Jesus as “good teacher”, an epithet he applies to Jesus with a meaning that Jesus rejects. Zacchaeus, however, in the manner of the blind beggar, takes measures to truly see Jesus and, in his encounter, is enabled to address him as *Kyrie* and to become free with respect to his wealth.

(4) As a foil to the true mode of seeing, Luke shows the Pharisees’ way of “looking at” Jesus and the Reign of God as a *paratē-rēsis*—a manipulative scrutiny of surfaces which cannot perceive either his true identity or the presence of the Reign.

(5) When the seventy-two return from their first successes, Jesus calls them beyond rejoicing about their apparent power over the demonic (even in his name) to a way of seeing their mission success as an expression of their relationship to the Father (10,20-22).

(6) The Samaritan leper moves from simply being part of a group addressing Jesus as “Master” (*epistata*) to distinguishing himself as one who truly “sees” that he was healed by God and that the presence of Jesus is the place to glorify God.

(7) Even the crowds of disciples who can hail Jesus at 19,37-38 as a king whose reign is evidenced in healing and who “comes in the name of the Lord”—even those people need to witness the forgiving death of the innocent one before they “return” in repentance.

(8) And yet it takes the Easter understanding, expressed in the Emmaus encounter and the Jerusalem appearance, to fully open blind eyes. It was not sufficient to see Jesus as a “prophet powerful in word and deed before God and all the people” (24,19). He would finally be seen most fully in the context of the breaking of the bread and the opening of the Scriptures—an understanding which embraces the Messiah’s death, his resurrection, and the church’s mis-



sion to preach repentance for the remission of sins to all the nations (24,46-47). In Acts (26,18) that mission will be described as a matter of opening eyes and turning from darkness to light.

Creighton University  
Omaha, NE 68178  
U.S.A.

Dennis HAMM, S. J.

## SOMMAIRE

Comme chacun des évangélistes, Luc a sa manière propre de développer les dimensions symboliques de la cécité et de la vue physiques comme métaphore pour la cécité et la vue spirituelles. Par son usage des images d'Isaïe, par sa rédaction et sa narration du matériel en 18,18-19,10 (le chef riche, l'aveugle de Jéricho, Zachée), par sa présentation de la foi du lépreux samaritain guéri, par sa mise en scène de la "vue" sous la croix, et par sa célébration de la révélation d'Emmaus, le troisième évangéliste présente Jésus à la fois comme objet de la vision la plus profonde, qui est la foi, et comme celui que la rend possible. Le "regard" des Pharisiens sert de repoussoir pour montrer leur fausse vision de la *paratērēsis*.

Cet article de Hamm suit la méthode de la critique de la composition, avec une attention particulière au style, à la narration et aux allusions à la LXX.

---

## The Sadducees and Resurrection from the Dead: Luke 20,27-40

---

This essay is concerned with the Lucan form of Jesus's response to the Sadducees' problem which may be summarized by their question, "At the resurrection whose wife will she be?"<sup>(1)</sup>.

Two questions are particularly interesting. First, does Jesus's statement that there will be no marrying in the age to come mean that all marriage is excluded in the age to come<sup>(2)</sup>? If not, why not? Secondly, how does the quotation of Moses in Luke 20,37 (Exod 3,16) that argues to the fact that the dead rise, fit into the argument of Luke 20,38, "Yahweh, however, is not God of dead people, but of living people, for all to/for Him live"?

### I. The Sadducees and their problem (vv. 27-33).

1) The problem the Sadducees pose is based on a prescription of the Law of Moses (Deut 25,5-10)<sup>(3)</sup>. As Deuteronomy expresses it,

<sup>(1)</sup> The parallels are Mark 12,18-27 and Matt 22,23-33; at times in this essay reference will be made to the Marcan parallel.

<sup>(2)</sup> Many authors think that Jesus is here denying marriage in the afterlife. Most all authors agree that Jesus is denying all marriage in the afterlife on the score that marriage is linked to death; where there is no death there is no marriage: "... nur ein sterbliches Geschlecht die Fortpflanzung und damit die Ehe nothwendig macht...". B. WEISS, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas* (Göttingen 1901) 608; "But 'in that age' when they no longer die... there will be no marriage", J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (New York 1985) 1300. On the other hand, "Il est donc vain de chercher ici un enseignement quelconque sur l'état futur des époux ou sur la disparition des sexes...", E. CHARPENTIER, "Tous vivent pour lui Lc 20,27-38", *Assemblées du Seigneur* ns 63 (1971) 89. This view encourages one to see Jesus's words as severely limited in scope, and by design.

<sup>(3)</sup> FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1299, notes also Gen 38,8 as a source from which this present presentation of the Levirate Law is drawn.

there is a duty to be performed in certain circumstances; these circumstances include the following points. First, "brothers live together" (v. 5), i.e., close relatives live in such proximity to one another that, even though they are married, they all assume responsibility for the continuation of their family or clan. Secondly, death prevents one of the married brothers from having a male heir. Thirdly, the first-born male heir is vital so that the deceased's name be not blotted out from Israel (v. 6), so that a brother's name be made to rise up in Israel (v. 7), so that the deceased brother's house be perpetuated (v. 9). Finally, to remedy the effect of death, the deceased's brother (= clan brother), who is the widow's brother-in-law (= *Levir*, in Latin), is commanded to marry the widow in order to produce from her a male heir to the name of the deceased. In this way, what death threatens to do is nullified by the foresight of the Mosaic Law.

To put it another way, the Law of Moses recognized the need for a husband and wife, whatever other reasons there may have been for their marrying, to produce a male in order to "perpetuate the name" of the husband when death takes him. Preservation of a name (and all that the "name" involves), then, is a concern which impinges on marriage, making re-marriage at times obligatory; it is death which can necessitate, as Jesus will put it, men "marrying" (Luke 20,34) and a widow "being given repeatedly in marriage" (Luke 20,34), "being made (by the Law) to marry" (Luke 20, 35)<sup>(4)</sup>.

2) It is possible to see in the Sadducees' problem a certain seriousness, if they believed in a life after death. If they did not so believe, the motive for bringing up a difficult question which makes life after death problematical, at least for some Israelites, seems suspicious. The Synoptic Gospel writers make sure that their readers know the truth underlying the question put to Jesus; we are told right at the beginning that the Sadducees oppose belief in the resurrection of the dead (Matt 22,23; Mark 12,18; Luke 20,27)<sup>(5)</sup>. This

<sup>(4)</sup> These translations of *gamiskō*, *gamidsō* — admittedly hypothetical — will be discussed later.

<sup>(5)</sup> The Sadducees' question "is designed to ridicule a belief of Jesus", D. DAUBE, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London 1956) 160; "En lui posant ce cas, ils veulent le forcer à désavouer cette croyance (en la résurrection), ou la ridiculiser en montrant à quelles aberrations elle aboutit",

clarification about the Sadducees can only be meant as a help to putting their "worrisome problem" in the proper light; Jesus does not need this help. It also suggests that, if Jesus wants to answer the Sadducees thoroughly, he will not stop at answering their explicit problem, but will go to the heart of their contestation: the rightness of belief itself in life after death<sup>(6)</sup>.

3) Traditionally, the Sadducees' denial of a resurrection to life is related to their conviction about the Jewish Scriptures. To the Sadducees only the Books of Moses form the grounding of belief; if through their interpretation<sup>(7)</sup> of these Mosaic works a belief cannot be grounded, they do not believe — despite the witness in favor of belief given by later writings which even the Sadducees admit are noble and useful for piety. The Sadducees, in relation to our question here, find no grounds in Moses' words for belief in resurrection. The more one reflects on the source of the Sadducees' opposition to resurrection — their interpretation that the Mosaic Law about Levirate marriage in Deuteronomy argues against resurrection from the dead —, the more one realizes the impact of Jesus's citing Moses himself as proof that indeed there is a life after death<sup>(8)</sup>.

Apart from its own nice turn to the argument, the reference to Moses indicates that Jesus is carefully adapting himself at all points possible to the framework out of which the Sadducees fashion their problem; he lets them determine the limits within which he will respond to them. This is a cardinal principle by which Jesus's words are to be understood.

---

CHARPENTIER, "Tous vivent", 85; "Posing resurrection problems was a favourite game of the Sadducees and often an embarrassment to the Pharisees", E. ELLIS, *The Gospel of Luke* (London 1966) 236; "der höhnische Zynismus, der in der Frage steckt...", J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg 1977) 543; cf. A. STÖGER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Düsseldorf 1966) 179.

<sup>(6)</sup> What all three synoptic writers want their readers to know is that what is really at stake here is not a problem of the futures of seven men and one woman, but "eine Polemik gegen die Auferstehung selbst", G. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Kapitel 11–24* (Würzburg 1977) 405; cf. G. HAHN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas II* (Breslau 1894) 519.

<sup>(7)</sup> "Eine starrer Konservatismus band sie an den Buchstaben der Gebote", ERNST, *Das Evangelium*, 543.

<sup>(8)</sup> Jesus's argument is drawn "aus jenem Teil des Alten Testaments (Pentateuch), dessen Autorität auch die Sadduzäer anerkennen", W. SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Zurich 1980) 196.

## II. The response of Jesus (vv. 34-38).

In two main points Luke differs from Mark<sup>(9)</sup>.

1) In Mark, Jesus begins and ends his response to the Sadducees with words of criticism. He begins by a rather sharp and penetrating evaluation of their competence, "Is not your erring due to the fact that you do not really know the Scriptures and do not know the power of God?" (Mark 12,24). He ends with a trenchant summary which is all the more significant for its not needing to have been said, "You err greatly" (Mark 12,27).

In Luke, both of these *ad hominem*-type statements are dropped<sup>(10)</sup>. Perhaps it is enough for Luke to let the argument of Jesus carry its own weight, without including statements which mold his words into a form of contestation. If in Mark Jesus's introductory and concluding remarks were spoken with the hope that the Sadducees might be moved to repent of their view, in Luke Jesus's words are characterized purely as teaching and thus are removed from the Marcan framework of contestation<sup>(11)</sup>. Jesus's critical

<sup>(9)</sup> For a discussion of Luke's dependence on Mark, cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1299, who sees Luke's passage as based solely on Mark, as does I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter 1978) 738; SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium*, 404; SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium*, 196; ERNST, *Das Evangelium*, 542; that Luke depends on more than Mark, see W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT 3; Berlin 1971) 374: "da die Formulierungen semitische Sprachform tragen"; ELLIS, *The Gospel*, 234: "Perhaps they (34-35a, 36, 38b) represent a tradition independent of the second Gospel"; C. MONTANTI, "Lc 20,34-36 e la filiazione divina degli uomini", *BeO* 13 (1971) 267: "Lc 20,34-36 non è esclusivamente una rielaborazione del corrispondente testo di Marco". As examples of Montanti's reasoning on this point, I note two particular items: 1. Luke used a source besides Mark, but tried to meld them together so that, whereas Luke's other source had *gamidsontai* twice, Luke changed one of these to accommodate Mark's *gamiskontai*; 2. "sono figli di Dio" è manifestamente una aggiunta (da Luca) per la ripetizione di *estin*" 270; apparently in agreement with this latter suggestion is M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris 1947) 516.

<sup>(10)</sup> For the type of literary form here in Luke, cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1299, who cites Bultmann's view. Yet, the elements which characterize Mark as conflictual are intentionally removed in Luke, and so the literary form changes.

<sup>(11)</sup> Cf. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium*, 406, who sees the atmosphere of the

words in Mark, however, underline that we are dealing here with a question certainly far more serious than the immediately preceding question regarding payment of taxes to Caesar, as far as Luke is concerned. The question of resurrection from the dead finds itself at the very heart of the belief in Jesus whose resurrection forms in Luke's Acts of the Apostles the primary witness about Jesus and the essence of a proclamation which the Sadducees, above all others, cannot tolerate (Acts 4,1-2.5; 5,17; 23,6-10)<sup>(12)</sup>.

2) With 20,35 Luke introduces into the Marcan rendition of Jesus's words a moral tone. This addition is crucial for understanding why Jesus believes in a resurrection from the dead; we will see this later. This addition means that, rather than concentrating on the question the Sadducees pose to him, Jesus thinks it vastly more important to concentrate on requirements for entry into the life of the age to come. For him, only those judged worthy of such a life will be raised; indeed, one must be a child of God, for this is what the public act of resurrection proclaims<sup>(13)</sup>. If one understands the implications of this relationship with God, one will have grasped far more than a direct answer to the Sadducees' question can give.

### III. The meaning of v. 35.

At first reading, Jesus's statement that those who are worthy of the next life "do not marry and are not given in marriage" means that, unlike in this age, in the next age there is simply no marriage.

---

pericope to indicate that we are dealing here with "Lehre Jesu" rather than conflict or contestation.

(12) In regard to Luke's effort to show continuity of Old and New Testament teaching on resurrection from the dead ("Moses to Jesus"), cf. SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium*, 196; to this continuity the Sadducees are a major obstacle, for to them "Das Gesetz rechnet nicht mit der Auferstehung der Toten", STÖGER, *Das Evangelium*, 180.

(13) For Jesus and Luke, being a child of God is what causes resurrection, and resurrection is what gives visibility to "child of God", as effect gives visibility to cause; apparently in agreement is ELLIS, *The Gospel*, 237, "Resurrection life signifies sonship". *Contra*, MARSHALL, *The Gospel*, 742, "Inasmuch as they are 'sons of the resurrection'... men become sons of God"; cf. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium*, 375, "Auferstehung ist Ursache und Voraussetzung der Gottesschaft und Engelgleichheit".

But it is doubtful that his statement really means this<sup>(14)</sup>. What is conclusive in this regard is the context, formulated by the Sadducees, in which Jesus responds.

In Luke, the Sadducees' concluding question, "The wife then in the resurrection, whose wife will she be, for seven men had her as wife?" (Luke 20,33), suggests that the Sadducees have told their sad story solely to affirm that the woman had been the legitimate wife of seven different men, each of which qualifies equally to be her husband in the age to come. But to separate this concluding question from the story that preceded it is to fail to recognize a meaningful element which belongs to the question and determines its meaning. What is this element?

Now it is one thing to report that, since the first husband (or the second or the third) died without male issue, there was need for still another marrying. However, it is quite another thing to report that *all seven* husbands died without issue *and* that the woman died also (Luke 20,31-32). To report that the second husband, for instance, died childless indicates that a third marriage is called for. But what purpose does the actual report of vv. 31-32 serve, unless the Sadducees are assuming that the purpose of marriage which was underlined in the first marriage and which necessitated the following six marriages is the reason why the woman will have to be the wife of one of the seven, once they all enter life after rising from the dead? In other words, the Sadducees are interested only in knowing who will procreate the child which had not been procreated in this age; they assume that the next age is like enough to this age and that what was demanded in this age will be demanded in the next<sup>(15)</sup>. It is left to Jesus to decide, not what will go on in the next

(14) In Jesus's mind, all forms of marriage may well be excluded in the age to come. But as the story is told, Jesus need not say this, because he has not been asked a question which would seek his opinion about all forms of marriage (including sexuality) in the age to come.

(15) Authors describe the Sadducees' expectations of the age to come variously. CHARPENTIER, "Tous vivent", 88, "... en voulant imaginer la vie après la mort sur le modèle de la vie actuelle"; ELLIS, *The Gospel*, 235, "Doubtless the (Sadducees') argument (against resurrection from the dead) was effective against the common view that resurrection life was merely an extension of the good life of this age"; SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium*, 406, "Die Frage geht von der Voraussetzung aus, dass die Frau schliesslich einem der sieben Bruder gehören müsse"; ERNST, *Das Evangelium*, 544, "Wenn das

age, but only who of seven husbands will be the one to raise up a male heir from this woman. Stress on this aspect of the seven marriages in this age is visible in the way Luke tells the story. The marriages themselves are subordinated to the repeated fact that each ended *hōsautōs*: without male heir. The Sadducees' challenge to Jesus, then, is circumstanced by this need to produce an heir, in this age or in the age to come. Their question, therefore, is more completely and properly put: Whose wife will she be, so that a male heir may be raised up in the age to come, since they all have died to this age without male heir?

The full context, then, determines what precisely is the question the Sadducees pose. Jesus's response recognizes the precise nature of the question he is to address. To be exact, Jesus's use of *gameō* shows his acceptance of the limited question of the Sadducees<sup>(16)</sup>. In v. 34 *gamiskontai* indicates a repetitive aspect to marriage which corresponds very well with the situation of the woman described by the Sadducees. In v. 35 *gamidsontai* suggests a being 'forced' to marry, which corresponds to the situation of the woman forced by the Law to enter six marriages, as are the six brothers as well.

---

jenseitige Leben nichts anderes ist als die Verlängerung und ins Wunderbare gesteigerte Gestalt des diesseitigen, dann hatte die Sadduzäerfrage ihr gutes Recht"; STÖGER, *Das Evangelium*, 181, "die Freude am Kinde wird überreich erfüllt".

<sup>(16)</sup> As indicated in note 4, translations of these forms of *gameō* are hypothetical. As for *gamidsō*, it is perhaps too much to press a sense of "forcing one to marry", though the verb is used designedly for those situations in which a woman's future is determined by another (1 Cor 7,38); in this response of Jesus, the "other" would be the Levirate Law. As for *gamiskō*, it is quite true that the *loci citati* of the dictionaries do not carry any sense of repetitiveness and thus make my view 'antiquarian', but two questions lead toward an acceptance of my understanding. First, is Luke, aware of Mark's upcoming *gamidsontai*, using *gamiskontai* at an earlier place simply as a synonym? (Pace MONTANTI, my note 9). Secondly, though aware of the usual meaning of *gamiskontai*, Luke could be subtly recalling a repetitive sense of *-isk*, outmoded by Luke's day, yet part of the verb which makes it particularly significant in this Levirate Law situation. So it is reasonable to think Luke chose these verbs carefully in view of the circumstances within which Jesus is to frame his answer. Thus, it is the circumstances of the Sadducees' question which determine the way Jesus is to answer; the verbs reflect the effort to remain within these circumstances. Still, it remains true that this interpretation of these two verbs is hypothetical.



The combination of these verbal expressions together with the fuller contextual significance of the Sadducees' final question indicates that Jesus intends to address a question of marriage in the terms in which it is posed: "Which of the seven men will be husband of the woman in the next life, in order to raise up the requisite heir who will thwart the blotting out of the original husband's name, who will perpetuate the house of this man?"

It is to this limited question that Jesus responds; let us consider his answer.

Whatever the reasons for the first marriage mentioned by the Sadducees, certainly among them was the intention to raise a male heir to his father. As for the other six marriages, their only motivation, for men or woman, was to produce a male heir. Underneath this intention and this purpose lies the grimmest of all realities characteristic of this age: death. Death threatens the extinction of a man's name, a man's family, a man's patrimony. Marriage offers a principal means of thwarting this destructive effect of death; the Levirate Law in particular is aimed solely at offsetting this painful consequence of death. It is to this underlying root of all marriage, particularly of the kind of marriage which is totally a response to death, that Jesus addresses himself: the next age, he says, is characterized only by life; there is no death.

Once one enters the next age, one is angel-like<sup>(17)</sup>, one lives for-

(17) Better: "angel-equal." According to FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1305, "'they are like angels'. I.e. disembodied spirits who do not marry". But it seems preferable to see *isaggeloi gar eisin* as the explanation why those worthy of eternal life do not die (rather than "do not marry"). Cf. ELLIS, *The Gospel*, 237, "equal to the angels: in that they do not die"; E. SCHWEITZER, *The Good News According to Luke* (Atlanta 1984) 307, "They are equal to the angels: in their future immortality, not just in not being married"; STÖGER, *Das Evangelium*, 182, "unsterblich weil sie engelgleich sind"; B. EASTON, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh 1926) 300, "But the emphasis in 'like angels' lies in immortality and not in sexlessness"; W. HARRINGTON, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London 1968) 235, "those who are risen are, like the angels, immortal". More in accord with Fitzmyer is SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium*, 406, "dabei lag der Vergleichspunkt nicht bei 'Unsterblichkeit', sondern bei der 'Ehelosigkeit'". In terms of redaction criticism, B. WEISS's opinion (*Die Evangelien*, 608-609) is suggestive, "Dort (Mark 12, 25) schien bloss durch ihre Engelgleichheit der Fortfall der Ehe begründet, wobei Lk übersah, dass bei jener an eine dem Auferstandenen analoge himmlische Leiblichkeit gedacht ist, weshalb er die Reflexion auf die jedes Bedürfniss der

ever. The reason for this life without death is that one is recognized as a child of God; being raised from the dead is the public revelation of this intimate relationship with God<sup>(18)</sup>. There is in this phrase, 'child of God' (Luke 20,36), an approval by Jesus of a logic which says that a child of a Father who lives forever will live forever. By turning his attention from the Sadducees' precise *question* to address the *presupposition* of that question, Jesus shows how profoundly the Sadducees have misunderstood the nature of life in the age to come. He prefers to correct this misunderstanding rather than to determine which of the seven men will be husband of the woman. Indeed, if the Sadducees will accept Jesus's teaching, they themselves will be able to answer the question about husbands in the next life.

Jesus is not content, in Luke, to counter the Sadducees' misconceived marriage problem with the affirmation that there is no death in the age to come. He also must make it clear that this life is conceived properly only as the life of a child of God; in other words, this life is the life enjoyed by those judged worthy to live with God<sup>(19)</sup>. This clarification can be seen as a subtle spur to the Lucan reader to make sure he lives so as to be found worthy of this life. But it is more likely a form of further explanation of the life that knows no death. For one 'cannot die anymore' (a unique statement of Luke) precisely because one is a 'child of God'. Here we are being led very deeply into the logic of a life which knows no death. 'Child of God' suggests a relationship with a Person who is

---

Ehe ausschliessende Unsterblichkeit (die wieder mit dem zukünftigen Weltalter zusammenhängt) einschieben zu müssen glaubte".

(18) Life without death is recognized as the effect of "being children of God"; cf., e.g., SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium*, 406; SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium*, 196; STÖGER, *Das Evangelium*, 182; LAGRANGE, *Évangile*, 516. That the resurrection does not make one a child of God, but rather reveals one to be such, cf. ELLIS, *The Gospel*, 237, "Resurrection life signifies sonship".

(19) Therefore, the upcoming discussion of resurrection to life based on Exod 3 is already introduced in Jesus's linking "children of God" with life unending, and the question answered by Exod 3 is already, germinally, answered by Jesus's profound knowledge of what a "child of God" really means. In a sense, Jesus's "two" answers (as regards "marrying in the next life" and as regards "resurrection to life") are, in Luke, a profoundly unified answer, the one part leading (through Luke's redaction) naturally to the next.

so loving that He provides all He can, including life with Him forever, to one who has absolutely no hope or power to give it to himself. The life of the age to come, then, is a product, a consequence, an effect of love and can only be explained in reference to love<sup>(20)</sup>.

Thus, the Sadducees not only fail to understand how the age to come differs from this age, but fail to understand what it is that makes this life without end a certainty. Ultimately, their question and their refusal to believe in the resurrection from the dead reveals a painful misunderstanding of the nature of the God they claim to know. It is for this failure that Mark feels constrained to note twice the grossness of their error.

Jesus has given as complete an answer as he wishes to give the Sadducees in regard to the seven-husbanded woman as she passes, childless, from this life. But Jesus's attention lies elsewhere than in the predicament constructed by the Sadducees; he wants to show them that the life to come must be a reality, that they have every reason, from their own Jewish history, to believe in a resurrection to a life without death.

#### IV. The quotation of Exod 3,15.16 and Luke 20,37-38.

Luke introduces two changes *vis-à-vis* the Marcan text. First, in Mark, Jesus refers to what "you have read in the book of Moses, how God said to Moses..." (Mark 12,26); in Luke, Jesus refers to what "also Moses made clear when he says..." (Luke, 20 37). By this change Luke stresses that the decisive words about resurrection of the dead are words which Moses himself, the author of Exodus, narrates. The Sadducees' own convictions should make them listen attentively to this authoritative voice; moreover, Luke stresses by this re-writing that added to what Jesus has already said about the rising of those who are children of God should be what "also

(<sup>20</sup>) Though Jesus's resurrection has nothing to do with the brunt of his answer or of this essay, it is still appropriate to suggest, in view of this "love which brings life," that it is Jesus's union with the Father that assures his life after death.

Moses" (*kai Mōusēs*) has made clear. To Jesus's teaching is added the authority of Moses<sup>(21)</sup>.

Secondly, Mark (12,26) quotes Exod 3,6: "I the God of Abraham and God of Isaac and God of Jacob". In Luke, the Mosaic quotation is "Lord (= Yahweh) the God of Abraham and God of Isaac and God of Jacob" (20,37). Mark's quotation comes from the first verses of the burning bush story wherein Yahweh identifies Himself to Moses. Luke prefers to quote Yahweh's later self-identification, which is also given from the burning bush and, though spoken by Yahweh, is reported by Moses (thus, Luke 20,37 can refer to Exod 3,15.16). "Lord" (=Yahweh), in Luke's text, replaces "I" in Mark's text. Yahweh's mention of his proper name occurs at the crucial moment when Yahweh explains to Moses why the Israelites should respond with faith and alacrity to the exhortation to leave Egypt. To mention Yahweh's name is to move Israel to the greatest trust; because of Him their freedom will be assured. Luke professes that in this Name, this identification recalled to the Sadducees by Jesus, lies the reason for certainty that the dead rise. What in this phrase moves Jesus to certainty that the dead rise?

Undoubtedly, Jesus reads Exod 3,15.16 as words which indicate such a union between Yahweh and Abraham that Abraham simply must live<sup>(22)</sup>. The very grammar — genitival phrase — evokes the sense of "possessiveness" which the phrase expresses. It means little or nothing to argue that the phrase need not be understood as Jesus understands it; he is claiming that this highly revered phrase of Jewish tradition professes a love of God for Abraham which can only mean that Abraham will be forever with God<sup>(23)</sup>. For Jesus, this Exodus phrase is another way of saying "child of God", used by

(21) Note SCHNEIDER's distinction (*Das Evangelium*, 405), "Lukas leitet die Begründung des Auferstehungsglaubens nicht von der Schrift ab, sondern von der Lehre Jesu (v. 34)... Die Schrift kann nur Hinweise bieten (v. 37)". Schneider sees in *kai Mōusēs* a counter to the Sadducees' quoting Moses, as though Jesus uses Moses as well as they to make a point, *ibid.*, 407; on the other hand, EASTON, *The Gospel*, 301, thinks that *kai* is meant to accentuate a likeness of thinking between Moses and Jesus.

(22) FITZMYER notes (*Gospel*, 1301), "From this premiss, the nature of the 'living' God, and God's covenant with Abraham, the Lord infers the necessity of resurrection".

(23) "God continues to stand in a covenant relation with them... and death cannot break this relationship", MARSHALL, *The Gospel*, 738.

Jesus to explain, in an earlier sentence, why those so dear to God will not be dead forever. Yahweh's personal identification of Abraham as one over whom He is God is the personal witness that Abraham, His covenantal partner, will live with Him forever<sup>(24)</sup>. Jesus is staking his all on what he understands to be the fidelity of the One who committed Himself to Abraham. He believes that not even death will thwart the intentions of Yahweh's love<sup>(25)</sup>.

Given the love for Abraham which Jesus finds in the Exodus phrase, one is led to think that Jesus not only consciously chose a citation from books dearest to the Sadducees, but also consciously chose a principal text from within those very books which lies at the foundation of Israel and at the miracle of the Exodus. Especially, as we have noted, in the text cited by Luke, Yahweh's words were to serve as a reminder to Moses' contemporaries that it is Yahweh who orders the Exodus; it is He who mobilizes the Israelites in hope and joy. Why should the name "Yahweh" create such enthusiasm, faith and obedience in the people? Because it is the name which assures the love on which Israel is founded and by which Israel will continue to live despite all opposition; it is the name on which is founded all hope. It is the love within this name to which the Israelites respond with absolute confidence<sup>(26)</sup>.

The love, then, by which Abraham was chosen to be a friend of God, the love which effected the deliverance of the children of Abraham from death in Egypt — this is the love, Jesus claims, that will bring the dead to life. Such is the meaning for Jesus of the phrase, "Yahweh the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God

(24) "Die Selbstmitteilung Gottes als Herr des Bundes wird als Offenbarung des Lebens verstanden," ERNST, *Das Evangelium*, 544.

(25) "D'une manière plus précise, on peut dire que l'amour et la justice de Dieu (données de la foi juive) sont la cause de la résurrection", F. DREYFUS, "L'Argument scripturaire de Jésus en faveur de la résurrection des morts (Marc 12, 26-27)", *RB* 66 (1959) 215. Dreyfus spends much time in showing that the Exodus 3 formula, in the time of Jesus, had a forceful sense of God's fidelity to the patriarchs, a fidelity which saves, *ibid.* 216-220.

(26) The fifth of the five books revered by the Sadducees (Deuteronomy, from which sprang their Levirate problem) is replete with the encouragement to repent and remain faithful, in order to live. The Sadducees fall short of the implications of the love in which Deuteronomy's optimism is grounded.

of Jacob". Those judged worthy of life with Yahweh must rise, for His love for them knows no other conclusion.

Though it is the Exodus phrase which Jesus urges the Sadducees to understand as containing grounds for belief that the dead rise, Jesus has one more observation to make before he finishes his response. Let us look first at the Marcan expression of this final reflection, then at the Lucan expression of it.

It is important to observe that the subject of the Marcan sentence (Mark 12, 27) is Yahweh, referring back to the "I" of the Exodus phrase, "I the God of Abraham...". Thus, with "Yahweh" as subject of the sentence, "God" becomes the predicate noun (and could even therefore be translated as "a God"); the ordinary understanding of the word order Mark gives suggests this. This sentence, then, reflects upon the nature of Yahweh, rather than on the nature of God and means to re-state the point contained in the "possessiveness" of the Exodus expression as it relates directly to the dead: to have Yahweh as one's covenantal God is to live, not to die<sup>(27)</sup>. Jesus's final words in Mark's rendition, then, call attention in a most explicit way to the relationship between having Yahweh as one's God and the question of the dead rising to life: those over whom Yahweh is God can only live.

Luke also ends his account of Jesus's response to the Sadducees along the lines of Mark's words about "God not of dead people, but of living people", but then adds the clarification as to why such a description can be given to Yahweh. But to appreciate better Luke's presentation of Jesus's final sentence, let us attend to two particular points.

1) Luke's main clause (v. 38a) offers a word order different from Mark's: Luke puts *theos* as the opening word of the sentence and follows it with *de*<sup>(28)</sup>. That *theos* is now the first word of the sen-

<sup>(27)</sup> Thus, Mark's concluding verse can be understood as a conclusion of the Exodus phrase as the latter is related to the question of resurrection to life.

<sup>(28)</sup> In regard to *de*, B. WEISS notes (*Die Evangelien*, 610), "V. 38 erläutert mit *de*, wiefern darin ein Beweis für die Auferstehung liegt". FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1301, speaks of v. 38 as a conclusion, "Yahweh identifies himself to Moses as the God of the patriarchs who were long since dead — then they must be living in some sense, for this identification shows... even that Yahweh is a God of the living, not of the dead, and furthermore... that 'to him they are all alive'". Cf. also HAHN, *Das Evangelium*, 528, "Im Folgenden

tence does not change the fact that "Yahweh" (= *Kurios*) is subject of the verb *estin* or that *theos* is, as in Mark, in the predicative position<sup>(29)</sup>. What Luke has done in putting *theos de* as the beginning of his sentence is stress the word "God", thereby emphasizing that life is what Yahweh's love assures, and life is what Yahweh's divine power effects, in principle; to assume otherwise denies Yahweh's love and godly power. When Yahweh identifies Himself as God, He refers to the power on which His love can call; to be Yahweh is to produce only life. Luke seems to have substantiated Mark's opening complaint<sup>(30)</sup> against the Sadducees without quoting the actual words: they fail to understand the power of God. In so emphasizing *theos*, Luke also seems to draw even closer attention to Yahweh's self-description as "God of Abraham...", as though to underline the fact that it is Yahweh's being God that reveals His power to effect what His love promises<sup>(31)</sup>.

2) Luke proceeds to explain his main clause, that Yahweh is (a) God of living, not dead people<sup>(32)</sup>. He does this by noting that "all to/for Him live". The dative pronoun continues to refer to Yahweh<sup>(33)</sup>. The sense of the dative *autō* ("to Him", "for Him") is

---

heisst es nicht, wie man bei oberflächlicher Betrachtung erwarten konnte: *theos gar*, sondern: *theos de*, denn es soll nicht das *emēnusen* begründet werden. Vielmehr enthält v. 37 die *Propositio minor*".

<sup>(29)</sup> For *theos* as predicative noun, cf. B. WEISS, *Die Evangelien*, 610; MARSHALL, *The Gospel*, 743. That *Kurios* is in the line of a proper name, cf. HAHN, *Das Evangelium*, 528, "*Kurion* ohne Artik., denn es hat hier den Character eines *nom. prop.* = Jehova".

<sup>(30)</sup> Mark 12,24.

<sup>(31)</sup> Cf. MARSHALL, *The Gospel*, 738, "Mk 12, 24 a and b are taken (by Luke) in reverse order". Yet, it seems the text of Luke cannot be analyzed in this way; implicit in all of Jesus's answer is a need to give God's power its due.

<sup>(32)</sup> M. ZERWICK's observation, *An Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, trans. and ed. by M. Grosvenor (Rome 1974) 264, is extremely important, "*dsōntōn*: wt [without] art. stressing the qualitative aspect". This means, then, that the participle (*dsōntōn*) is in the present tense because it deals with a timeless quality, not a moment between past and future. Thus, to say Yahweh is (a) God of the living is not to affirm that people over whom He is God live *now*; rather life is, irrespective of time or instances, an intrinsic effect of Yahweh's love and power.

<sup>(33)</sup> This seems to follow logically, if Yahweh, not God, is subject of the main clause in v. 38.

usually explained as a kind of ethical dative or dative of respect<sup>(34)</sup>. Thus, "to/for Him" has the sense: "as far as he (Yahweh) is concerned", "in His (Yahweh's) eyes". How does this sense of *autō* fit into the subordinate clause and what does the entire subordinate clause mean to say, for Luke insisted on adding it to Mark's account?

Particularly in light of all that Jesus has said so far, this *gar* clause affirms that "as far as Yahweh is concerned", "speaking from His side only", all people are meant to live, not die<sup>(35)</sup>. Jesus is

<sup>(34)</sup> Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1306-1307, who notes apposite references to grammars. Cf. also CHARPENTIER, "Tous vivent", 93-94, instrumental dative "par lui, datif d'intérêt, pour lui"; SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium*, 407, *autō* "wohl Dativus ethicus oder commodi".

<sup>(35)</sup> Part of the difference of opinion about the interpretation of v. 38 (main clause, as well as *gar* clause) can be expressed by a distinction regarding the meaning of *dsōsin* in its present tense. Most all interpreters see in this verb a reference to time: *now*; thus, the subject of the verb lives *now*, which of course is meant to be puzzling to Jesus's listeners who know Abraham, for one, to have died. Cf., e.g., FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1301, "—then they must be living in some sense"; CHARPENTIER, "Tous vivent", 94, whose argument is that he who lived for Him will live for Him, for if they do not continue to live, He does not; GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium*, 375, "Dieses Leben ist ein Leben für Gott"; L. SABOURIN, *L'Évangile de Luc* (Roma 1985) 324, "Ils peuvent bien paraître mourir aux yeux des hommes, mais devant Dieu ils sont vivants"; SCHWEITZER, *The Good News*, 307, "They already experience the incursion of God"; HARRINGTON, *The Gospel*, 235, "the Patriarchs are still alive because God could not be named after a dead thing". However, there are two reasons for thinking that *dsōsin* in the present tense (much like *dsōntōn*) is not to be considered as expressing the sense of *now*. First, as the body of this essay indicates, such a sentence as v. 38a and the subsequent *gar* clause can be in the present tense because they express axiomatic truths about Yahweh. Secondly, there are many verbs in the words of the Sadducees and of Jesus which for various reasons, though in the present tense, do not signify actions going on *now*. In this regard, note the comments of HAHN, *Das Evangelium*, 525, "Die Praesentia *gamousin* statt der Futur zur Bezeichnung dessen, was ganz gewiss in der Zukunft zu erwarten ist... Mit Unrecht schliesst Bruston... aus dieser Praesentia... dass Eintritt in die künftige Weltzeit... als ein schon in der Gegenwart beständig geschehender gedacht sei" and 527, "Die Praes. *egeirontai* von dem, was mit Sicherheit zu erwarten ist...". Indeed, many verbs in this pericope suggest that the present tense means something other than the *now* moment — so with *dsōntōn* and *dsōsin*, for the right reasons. Along this line of argument, R. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden 1967) 21, gives one reason to pause when he notes the need to place a form



making a statement about what Yahweh, considered in Himself and left to His own nature, will do for everyone<sup>(36)</sup>, i.e., make everyone live, give everyone life<sup>(37)</sup>.

Such is the way things will naturally proceed, if Yahweh is left to Himself. Human beings for their part, however, can thwart Yahweh's intention to give life. By refusing Him they can destroy the intentions of Yahweh's love. Thus, in practice, the gift of love will reach only those dead who had Yahweh as their one and only God in such a way that they can be judged worthy of life forever with Him: these are His children. It is sin which causes death; Yahweh is God only of living beings.

By the use of *autō*, then, Jesus means to underline a quality which belongs to the nature of Yahweh's love: from it can only proceed life. As for the entire *gar* clause, it explains in its appeal to Yahweh's nature why it is right to say that Yahweh is (a) God of living beings<sup>(38)</sup>. The total affirmation, however, made up of main clause plus *gar* clause, is a re-statement of the logic by which, Jesus

---

of the verb "to be" between "*Kurios*" and "God of Abraham...". "The present tense... is necessary for the argument. Otherwise, the text would have shown only that at one time Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were alive; when no verb 'to be' is present in Hebrew or Aramaic, the present tense is implied". Correct may be Gundry's grammatical point, but I do disagree as to his first reasons why "the present tense... is necessary for the argument".

<sup>(36)</sup> The covenant love, which is central to the understanding of Jesus's teaching about resurrection from the dead, is to be understood primarily as the love which flows from Yahweh to His covenant partner, though the notion of "being deemed worthy of resurrection" suggests love which flows from the partner to Yahweh. CHARPENTIER, "Tous vivent", 92, among others, notes the two senses possible in the phrase "God of Abraham...", and prefers the second as the primary sense here, "le Dieu que ces patriarches ont adoré", and "le Dieu qui a protégé, sauvé ces patriarches".

<sup>(37)</sup> It is understood also that *pantes* refers to all human beings without any distinctions; in principle, all from God's perspective are meant to live. Contra, e.g., FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1307, who understands that *pantes* refers to the patriarchs and ultimately to all who are deemed worthy of resurrection; WEISS, *Die Evangelien*, 610, "Das *pantes* geht zwar... auf Alle, deren Gott er ist, weil es ein (religiöses) Verhältnis zu dem lebendigen Gott ohne Leben nicht geben kann".

<sup>(38)</sup> A paraphrase of vv. 37-38 would be: "Yahweh has declared Himself to be God of Abraham. This identification means, in regard to death, that Yahweh has a love which is joined to such supreme power that Yahweh can create only life, for His love and power, left to themselves, make all live".

says, Yahweh's being God of Abraham must mean that Abraham, even if he be dead, will live<sup>(39)</sup>. Such is the relationship revealed by Yahweh Himself.

\*  
\* \* \*

Jesus's answer to the Sadducees is by far much broader and more profound than they ever expected<sup>(40)</sup>: indeed, they thought their question would effect only confusion and embarrassment. Supposedly, he was to decide, if he were at all able, which of seven men, legally and even piously married, would be husband in the next age to an equally legally and piously married woman, so that a male heir might be raised up in the age to come for the benefit of the name of the woman's original husband. Jesus swiftly does away with any idea that marriage for this purpose makes sense for the age to come, for the first husband, who will enjoy life unending in the age to come, will need no heir to thwart death. But Jesus goes much further than this. He makes abundantly clear something essential which the Sadducees never understood about their own God: that union with Him can only assure life, can only issue in life forever. The love of Yahweh will never allow His children to remain dead, or, once risen, to ever die again.

True, Jesus never did say which of the seven men would be husband in the age to come, but he did forcefully affirm both who

<sup>(39)</sup> In this understanding of Luke's passage, the question of the kind of life Abraham lives now (cf. FITZMYER's lengthy discussion [*The Gospel*, 1301], to answer the question, "In what sense are the patriarchs alive?") is not suggested by Jesus's discussion with the Sadducees in this pericope. As WEISS, *Die Evangelien*, 610, noted long ago, "Dabei ist auf die Frage, ob sie leben oder todt sind, ob sie in Zwischenstand oder im Himmel leben, gar nicht reflektiert".

<sup>(40)</sup> Jesus's answer is often described as two-fold: first, he deals with the immediate problem posed by the Levirate Law question, then he treats of the necessity of resurrection from the dead without reference to the precise problem given him by the Sadducees. It is noteworthy that both parts of his answer form a neat verbal relationship. The first part speaks of the impossibility of death (*oude... apothanein*) because one is a child of God (*huios theou*); the second part speaks of the impossibility of Yahweh's being God of dead (*ouk... nekrōn*) because it is His nature that all live (*autō dsōsin*). Thus, death and life are played off against each other, with Yahweh as giver of life and His child as receiver of life. This verbal relationship is due in great part to Luke's redaction of Mark's text.

will enjoy life without end and why life after death for such a person must exist: it is all tied to the nature of Yahweh who, from the creation, through the Exodus, right up to the present moment has shown in the concrete events of history that it is His nature only to make things live. The Sadducees erred greatly, indeed, in not realizing that the love of Yahweh for them assures them of all good things, even life after death.

One is always on the lookout for "fittingsnesses", when one interprets. It seems particularly fitting that, after his brilliant teaching about the meaning of having Yahweh as one's God, Jesus "is asked no more questions" (Luke 20,40). Such a penetrating and exhilarating understanding of Yahweh, in Whose hands are all Israelites, makes look futile any further attempts to trap Jesus in questions of understanding the Jewish faith. It is also fitting that this be the final teaching of Jesus provoked by his opponents. For it is in his answer to them that one understands the source of his confidence at the moment of his imminent death. In firm faith in his conviction of what the history of Yahweh's deeds has taught him, Jesus knew he would rise again. It is Yahweh's being his God that assures Jesus that, even though dead, he will live<sup>(41)</sup>.

Theology Department  
Loyola University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois 60626

John J. KILGALLEN, S. J.

#### SOMMAIRE

Cet article développe les arguments suivants: (1) la question des Sadducéens (Luc 20,28-33) est seulement de savoir si oui ou non des mariages résultant de la Loi du Lévirat dans cet âge continueront dans l'âge à venir de telle sorte qu'un enfant pourrait être né au premier mari, sans enfant; (2) l'amour d'alliance de Yahwé (Ex 3,15.16), rendu en retour par les «enfants de Dieu», assure la résurrection des morts; (3) il n'est pas suggéré en Luc 20,38 qu'Abraham soit d'une manière ou d'une autre actuellement vivant.

(41) "It may be that Jesus' confidence in his own resurrection rested ultimately in such Scriptures as this word of God to Moses", ELLIS, *The Gospel*, 237.

---

## Ugarit and Daniel 7: A Missing Link

---

In dedicating this essay to the memory of Mitchell Dahood, I am all too conscious of its distance from both the methods and the writings of that fine scholar and finer friend. For Dahood was in love with the very words of the Hebrew Bible, of Ugaritic and Eblaite; and he dealt but rarely and in passing with the larger mythic patterns discernible in the Ugaritic and Hebrew texts. Nor did he, to my knowledge, publish more than a single, fleeting reference to Daniel 7, the chapter which is the beginning and end of the present study<sup>(1)</sup>. If, in what follows, I venture too far afield, I can only appeal to that Roman capacity for *pazienza* and *gentilezza* which characterized Mitchell Dahood's scholarship and his life.

### I. The Problem

[I]t may be wiser... to interpret Daniel from his predecessors than from his successors.

Adam C. Welch<sup>(2)</sup>

We cannot begin to appreciate a work such as Daniel until we become aware of the mythological echoes with which it rings.

John J. Collins<sup>(3)</sup>

But even examining Daniel's predecessors, except the older biblical texts, has its pitfalls.

Alexander A. Di Lella<sup>(4)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> In *Psalms III* (AB 17; Garden City 1970) 69, DAHOOD cited 'elyônîn of Dan 7,18.22.25 as an example of a plural of majesty.

<sup>(2)</sup> A. C. WELCH, *Visions of the End: A Study in Daniel and Revelation* (London 1958) 129.

<sup>(3)</sup> J. J. COLLINS, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula 1977) 96.

<sup>(4)</sup> L. F. HARTMAN and A. A. DI LELLA, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City 1978) 88. (In the sentence immediately preceding, Di Lella had quoted Welch's famous dictum.)

The purpose of the present study is to sketch the history of a mythic pattern and the subtle yet significant changes which it undergoes in its transmission from Late Bronze Age Canaan to Hellenistic Judaism. More specifically, its goal is to clarify the Canaanite and Israelite prehistory of the complex imagery found in the dream-vision of Dan 7,1-14, and especially vv. 9-14. Its thesis is that a sequential reading of the above quotations, all drawn specifically from discussions of Daniel 7, provides an accurate assessment of the prehistory of all the major images of the vision: the sea and its monstrous offspring, the Ancient of Days and his court, and the "one like a son of man" and his receipt of kingship.

The view that the vision of Daniel 7 reflects a mythic pattern deriving ultimately from Canaanite sources is, of course, hardly new. First adumbrated by Aage Bentzen<sup>(5)</sup>, it has been argued in its most developed form by John Collins<sup>(6)</sup>. In the Ugaritic formulation of the Canaanite myth, which remains the most complete available to us, Yamm/Sea challenges the patriarchal El and demands kingship over the gods. Yamm's purpose is thwarted by the storm-god Baal, who defeats his adversary in an epic battle; and it is Baal's kingship, not Yamm's, which is proclaimed and celebrated. Collins discerns a comparable, though not identical, movement in Daniel 7. There, in vv. 1-8, the "great sea" (*yammā' rabbā'*) produces a series of monstrous figures, the fourth of whom rises in revolt. Just as the image of *yammā' rabbā'* recalls Canaanite Yamm, so too "the imagery of Dan 7: 9-14 is unmistakable. It derives from a Canaanite enthronement scene in which Baal, rider of the clouds, approaches El, the whitehaired father of years, who confers kingship on him"<sup>(7)</sup>.

The attractiveness of this "Canaanite hypothesis" has been obvious to scholars since J. A. Emerton first reformulated Bentzen's position to take into account the parallels between Baal and the "one like a son of man"<sup>(8)</sup>. Carsten Colpe, after a rigorous investigation of possible non-Israelite antecedents of the latter figure and his role in Daniel, rejected as untenable Iranian, Gnostic, and other hypo-

<sup>(5)</sup> A. BENTZEN, *Daniel* (HAT 19; Tübingen <sup>2</sup>1952) 61; *King and Messiah* (London 1955) 74-75.

<sup>(6)</sup> COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 96-106, esp. 105-106.

<sup>(7)</sup> COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 101.

<sup>(8)</sup> J. A. EMERTON, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery", *JTS* 9 (1958) 225-242, esp. 230-234.

theses, but concluded that Canaan remained a possibility: "the Canaanite hypothesis does so far come closest to the actual facts", since it "carries with it a nexus of motifs which is lacking in the parallels of motif on which the other hypotheses lie"<sup>(9)</sup>.

There is, however, one serious problem which Emerton, Colpe, and Collins are all forced to acknowledge, but are unable to solve. How did such a mythic pattern reach the author<sup>(10)</sup> of Daniel 7? Of the three major elements in the vision — sea/beasts, Ancient of Days, and "one like a son of man" — only the first two possess a reasonably complete pedigree that allows us to move more or less smoothly from Late Bronze Canaan through monarchic Israel and down into post-exilic Judaism. Yet Colpe was forced to confess that "one cannot construct a genealogy of the Son of Man concept in the OT alone"<sup>(11)</sup>, and this despair has been echoed by Collins<sup>(12)</sup>. In short, a yawning gulf continues to separate Ugaritic Baal from the Hellenistic-Jewish "one like a son of man".

To be sure, both Emerton and Collins have tried to bridge the gap with imaginary materials — what Collins refers to as "independent mythological traditions"<sup>(13)</sup>. For Emerton, these hypothetical traditions originally formed part of the Israelite enthronement festival, as reconstructed by Sigmund Mowinckel and Bentzen<sup>(14)</sup>. To

<sup>(9)</sup> C. COLPE, "*Ho huios tou anthropou*. B. The Historical Problem", *TDNT* 8 (1972) 406-430, esp. 419. Even A. J. FERCH ("Daniel 7 and Ugarit: A Reconsideration", *JBL* 99 [1980] 75-86), who is so critical of the Canaanite hypothesis, is forced to admit that "the apocalyptic S[on of] M[an] and Ancient of Days may share some rather remote resemblances with Baal and El" (p. 85). For Collins' trenchant response to Ferch, see "Apocalyptic Genre and Mythic Allusions in Daniel", *JSOT* 21 (1981) 83-100, esp. 90-94.

<sup>(10)</sup> In speaking here and throughout the paper of "the author" of Daniel 7, I assume the unity of the chapter. For compelling arguments in support of this position, see COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 127-132; also M. DELCOR, "Les sources du chapitre VII de Daniel", *VT* 18 (1968) 290-312, esp. 291-294 (reprinted in M. DELCOR, *Études bibliques et orientales de religions comparées* [Leiden 1979] 154-176, esp. 155-158); DELCOR, *Le Livre de Daniel* (SB; Paris 1971) 141-143; Z. ZEVIT, "The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7", *ZAW* 80 (1968) 385-396, esp. 386-388.

<sup>(11)</sup> COLPE, *TDNT* 8 (1972) 406.

<sup>(12)</sup> COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 101 ("the imagery... can not be derived from the OT...").

<sup>(13)</sup> COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 101.

<sup>(14)</sup> EMERTON, "Son of Man", 230, 238-242. Emerton's own reconstruc-

this, Collins adds the tantalizing possibility of a direct borrowing of still extant Canaanite lore during the second century B.C.<sup>(15)</sup> The problems with both approaches are, however, all too obvious. The Israelite enthronement festival is itself a reconstruction, no matter how plausible; its ideological components, aside from those reflected in extant biblical texts, are purely hypothetical; and the very survival of festival or ideology into the post-exilic period in texts or traditions other than biblical is pure speculation. In other words, our hard evidence is limited precisely to that body of material which, according to Colpe and Collins, cannot yield a satisfactory genealogy.

Nor do I find Collins' theory of direct Hellenistic borrowing any more plausible. To be sure, I agree with Collins that there is "no reason... to doubt that ancient traditions closely related to the Ugaritic myths were available in the second century B.C."<sup>(16)</sup>, but what I seriously doubt is that the impeccably orthodox Jewish author of Daniel 7 would turn to such a source for inspiration when presenting the heavenly scene which forms the very climax of his dream-vision. Even in the non-Israelite Hellenistic works which Collins cites to buttress his theory (Philo of Byblos, Berossus, and the Potter's Oracle), what we see is an author turning, in each case, to the old traditions of his own culture, not those of his neighbors<sup>(17)</sup>. If we are

---

tion of a pre-Davidic Jebusite rite and its subsequent, purely hypothetical modification and transmission to the author of Daniel 7 has (rightly, in my view) not found a favorable reception.

<sup>(15)</sup> COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 102-104.

<sup>(16)</sup> COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 104.

<sup>(17)</sup> This is not, of course, to deny that Daniel and these other works are free from foreign influence, especially in matters broadly cosmological. However, the suggested points of contact are with ideas that have become widespread in the Hellenistic world, rather than those that remain limited to a specific foreign culture. The four-kingdom schema of Daniel 2 and 7, the four metals of Daniel 2, and the possible astronomical symbolism of the four beasts in Daniel 7 all belong to the former type, Collins's Baal-like "son of man" to the latter. Nowhere else in Daniel do we find evidence of such direct religious influence.

(On the four-kingdom schema and the four metals, see COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 37-43, 62-63 [with references to earlier literature]; on the symbolism of the four beasts, see A. CAQUOT, "Sur les quatre bêtes de *Daniel* VII", *Sem* 5 [1955] 5-13; "Les quatre bêtes et le «Fils d'homme» (*Daniel* 7)", *Sem* 17 [1967] 37-71.)

to build a sure bridge between Baal and the "one like a son of man", we must build it of extant material, actual texts available both to us and to the author of Daniel 7. We must, in other words, look to biblical texts.

There is, moreover, a positive reason for such an approach; namely, that so many of the images and motifs, both major and minor, found in the vision of Daniel 7 do in fact have a demonstrably biblical pedigree. Among these we must include:

1. the "great sea" as a symbol of chaos<sup>(18)</sup>;
2. the "winds of heaven" stirring up the sea<sup>(19)</sup>;
3. the "great sea" as a spawning ground of Yhwh's enemies<sup>(20)</sup>;
4. the description of the fourth beast<sup>(21)</sup>;
5. the association of horns with kingship and/or might<sup>(22)</sup>;
6. the arrogant speech that leads to judgment<sup>(23)</sup>;
7. the heavenly court and positioning of thrones<sup>(24)</sup>;

(18) HARTMAN (-DI LELLA, *Daniel*, 211) notes the *těhôm rabbāh*, "great deep", of Gen 7,11; Isa 51,10; Amos 7,4. See also H. G. MAY, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *Mayim Rabbim*, 'Many Waters'", *JBL* 74 (1955) 9-21.

(19) The winds of heaven stirring up the great sea recall Gen 1,2. Their number may be simply a function of the four-kingdom scheme of Daniel 2 and 7, and therefore need not be connected to the "four corners (of the earth)" of Mesopotamian tradition. Within the context of the vision, the activity of the winds obviously underlines the absolute control of the Ancient of Days; even the chaotic/evil kingdoms owe their origin and fleeting power to divine sufferance.

(20) In addition to the biblical texts cited by HARTMAN (-DI LELLA, *Daniel*, 212) and COLLINS (*Apocalyptic Vision*, 96-97) and mentioning the sea-monsters Rahab, Leviathan, and the *tannin*-dragon, note also Pharaoh's dream in Gen 41,1-8, where symbolic animals rise out of the Nile (itself elsewhere assimilated to the waters of chaos). On sea-monsters as symbolic of foreign nations, cf. Isa 30,7; Ezek 32,2-8; Ps 87,4.

(21) See especially the horrifying description of Leviathan in Job 40,25-41,26 [English 41,1-34]. Leviathan is there appropriately styled "king over all the children of pride" (*melek 'al-kol-bēnē-šāḥaš*, 41,26 [41,34]).

(22) Note 1 Sam 2,10; Ps 18,3; Ps 89,18.25. It is God's prerogative to "raise the horn" of his chosen one(s); to do so on one's own initiative is tantamount to rebellion (Ps 75,5-6).

(23) See Isa 10,8-12 (Assyria); Isa 14,4-23 (Babylon); Ezek 28,2-10 (Tyre).

(24) On the heavenly court and divine throne, see 1 Kgs 22,19; Job 1,6;



8. the "Ancient of Days"<sup>(25)</sup>;
9. the whiteness of snow and the purity of wool<sup>(26)</sup>;
10. the wheeled throne with fiery flames<sup>(27)</sup>;
11. the angelic attendants<sup>(28)</sup>;
12. the heavenly books<sup>(29)</sup>;
13. the fate of the fourth beast<sup>(30)</sup>;
14. the idiom "son of man"<sup>(31)</sup>;
15. the "clouds of heaven"<sup>(32)</sup>;
16. the granting of universal and everlasting kingship<sup>(33)</sup>.

2,1; Isa 6,1-3; Ps 89,15; etc. Two thrones are assumed in Ps 110,1, and "thrones for judgment, thrones of the house of David" are located in Jerusalem according to Ps 122,5.

<sup>(25)</sup> The phrase has no precise parallel in biblical texts, but certainly recalls such titles as "everlasting father" (*'ābī-'ad*, Isa 9,5), "eternal God" (*'ēlōhē 'ōlām*, Isa 40,28), and "eternal king" (*melek 'ōlām*, Jer 10,10; cf. Ugaritic *mlk 'lm* in RS 24.252).

<sup>(26)</sup> The source of the similes is obviously Isa 1,18. It should be emphasized that in Hebrew, as in Ugaritic, grey hair is a sign of age. "White" is associated with brightness, cleanliness, and purity; see the discussion of Hebrew *lābān* in A. BRENNER, *Colour Terms in the Old Testament* (JSOT Supp 21; Sheffield 1982) 81-94. In Daniel 7, God has white clothing and hair not because he is ancient (which he is), but because his judgments are just. Similarly in Isa 1,18, the reversion to a state of whiteness follows immediately upon a call to "seek justice" (*diršū mišpāt*, v. 17).

Both Ugaritic El and Daniel's "Ancient of Days" are patriarchal figures, but the antiquity of the latter is no more dependent on his "white" hair than that of the former is dependent upon our accepting the equation *'ab šnm* = "Father of Years".

<sup>(27)</sup> The description of the throne clearly draws on Ezekiel's visions of the chariot throne (Ezek 1; 10).

<sup>(28)</sup> See Deut 33,2; Ps 68,18.

<sup>(29)</sup> See Mal 3,6; Isa 65,6, and the other texts cited by HARTMAN (-DI LELLA, *Daniel*, 218).

<sup>(30)</sup> The fourth beast is not defeated as if it were a legitimate foe, but executed like the rebel Achan, who has violated the ban (Josh 7,25). The desecration of an enemy's corpse by burning is condemned in Amos 2,3, but comparable defilement is permissible in the case of criminals who have transgressed divine law (Josh 7,25; 2 Kgs 23,16.20).

<sup>(31)</sup> See Num 23,19; Isa 51,12; Ps 8,5.

<sup>(32)</sup> Clouds are a common feature of Yhwh's theophany; see Exod 19,16; Deut 33,26; Pss 68,5; 104,3.

<sup>(33)</sup> Note especially those texts elaborating on the eternal covenant with David and the universal rule of the Davidic king: 2 Sam 7,8-16; 23,1-7; Isa 9,6-7; Ps 110. (On Ps 89,20-38, see the discussion below.)

The overwhelming contribution of Israelite tradition to the imagery and motifs of Dan 7,1-14 is obvious from this list. *A priori* we have every right to expect the same biblical tradition to supply us with one or more intermediate stages between Baal and the "one like a son of man"<sup>(34)</sup>. And, *pace* Colpe and Collins, I believe that it does so, especially in Psalms 89 and 8. Before turning to these texts, however, it is necessary to look more closely at the first link in our chain of transmission.

## II. A Mythic Pattern at Ugarit?

More than a half-century after their discovery, the Ugaritic mythological texts retain many of their secrets. Like Baal in *CTA* 3.C.17-25 (= *UT* 'nt: III: 17-25), they have a tale they would tell us, but it is still largely a tale that even the most careful philologist does not know, the most sensitive exegete does not understand — a whisper of damaged clay, a sighing of debated lexemes. Insofar as the present study deals with a specific mythic pattern, it is possible to avoid lengthy discussions of philological minutiae. Something must, however, be said about the unity, arrangement, and interpretation of the so-called Baal Cycle (*CTA* 1-6), and this for two reasons. On the one hand, the unity of the cycle is still being challenged, most recently by Richard J. Clifford<sup>(35)</sup>. On the other hand, any assessment of early Israelite transformations of Canaanite mythic patterns must necessarily be based on our reconstructed understanding of those chronologically prior patterns. A full discussion of these issues obviously lies beyond the scope of the present essay, and I propose here simply to indicate my reasons for rejecting Clifford's position and to sketch briefly my own understanding of the Baal Cycle and its inherent unity.

According to Clifford, "the chief reason for doubting 'that *CTA*

(<sup>34</sup>) DI LELLA (*Daniel*, 86-87) apparently thinks it sufficient to list the many occurrences of Aramaic *br* 'n(w)š and Hebrew *ben* 'ādām. For me, the frequency of the idiom cannot in itself justify Di Lella's conclusion that "there seems to be no mystery as to the meaning and background of the 'one in human likeness'" (87).

(<sup>35</sup>) R. J. CLIFFORD, "Cosmogonies in the Ugaritic Texts and in the Bible", *Or* 53 (1984) 183-201.

1-6 all belong to the same series' is that Mot is the enemy of Baal in tablets 4-6 whereas Yam is the enemy in tablets 2-3"<sup>(36)</sup>. Directly linked to this is the argument "that in the Bible Yahweh's battles with sea and desert (the place of death) are treated as separate, non-continuous stories"<sup>(37)</sup>. Such reasoning, however, risks confusing unity of plot with unity of incident. The Gilgamesh epic remains a brilliantly coherent work despite the multiplicity of the hero's battles, for Gilgamesh's encounters with Enkidu, Humbaba, the Bull of Heaven, and his own mortality are incidents so integrated as to form necessary parts of a single whole. That Baal's fight is now with Yamm, now with Mot need not vitiate attempts to discern a similar, overarching unity in the Baal Cycle.

As for Clifford's appeal to biblical tradition, I confess that I agree wholeheartedly with his identification of desert as the realm (or one part of the realm) of death. Indeed, I shall shortly go further and suggest that in the Ugaritic texts, as well, it is the entrance to the realm of Death, i.e., Mot. But I cannot agree that in the Bible God's battles with sea and desert are always treated as "separate, non-continuous stories". Of the two texts Clifford cites to support his assertion, only one (Deut 32,7-14) does so. The other (Isa 43,16-21) emphatically does not. One has only to read vv. 16-19 to realize the close link between sea and desert:

Thus said the LORD,  
Who made a road through the sea  
And a path through mighty waters,  
.....  
I am about to do something new;  
Even now it shall come to pass,  
Suddenly you shall perceive it:  
I will make a road through the wilderness  
And rivers in the desert (*NJV*)<sup>(38)</sup>.

<sup>(36)</sup> CLIFFORD, "Cosmogonies", 189.

<sup>(37)</sup> CLIFFORD, "Cosmogonies", 189. Clifford advances other reasons for fragmenting the cycle even further (p. 189-193), but I must confess that I find his arguments neither consistent nor compelling. Like J. C. L. Gibson (see below, n. 42), my own approach to *CTA* 1-6 remains unswervingly "unitarian".

<sup>(38)</sup> If it is true that only one of the two desert texts to which CLIFFORD appeals ("Cosmogonies", 189, n. 17) reflects the Baal-Mot story independent

Admittedly, the juxtaposition of past and future salvation is typically Deutero-Isaianic. The same, however, cannot be said of the linking of sea and desert. This is no innovation of the exilic prophet, but a firmly rooted feature of Pentateuchal lore. Already in these early traditions, Israelite historical experience has been so structured as to recall the mythic pattern of the Baal Cycle. The crossing of the Red Sea, the storm-theophany at Sinai with attendant construction of the tabernacle, and the guidance through the wilderness cannot and should not be severed from the rival pattern of Baal's routing of Sea (with Kothar's aid), his construction of a palace and theophany on Zaphon (with El's sanction and Kothar's aid), and his battle with Death (resolved finally by El's intervention)<sup>(39)</sup>. If the biblical pattern mirrors the Canaanite in schematic movement of plot (sea — mountain/palace — desert/death), it also challenges and undermines the latter's theological claims by proclaiming the absolute power of the Israelite deity — a God who acts unaided, and who thunders forth his word even in the desert of death. What we see reflected in the Torah's traditions is, I would suggest, an early and anonymous example of the phenomenon Harold Bloom has termed "creative misreading" by a "strong reader":

The strong reader, whose readings will matter to others as well as to himself, is... placed in the dilemmas of the revisionist, who wishes to find his own original relation to truth, whether in texts or in reality (which he treats as texts anyway), but also wishes to open received

---

of any reference to Yamm, the converse is equally true. Not all the biblical texts he cites as mirroring the Baal-Yamm story independent of Mot (desert) in fact do so. For example, in Exod 15,12-13, the underworld ('*āreš*) swallows the Egyptians, while Israel is led (implicitly, to be sure) through the desert, the realm of Mot, to "your holy encampment". And Ps 114, which Clifford also invokes, explicitly links desert to sea and hill country in vv. 5-8: "What alarmed you, O sea [cf. Yamm], that you fled, / Jordan [cf. Nahar], that you ran backward, // mountains [cf. Zaphon], that you skipped like rams, / hills, like sheep? // Tremble, O earth [or underworld: cf. Mot], at the presence of the LORD, / at the presence of the God of Jacob, // who turned the rock into a pool of water [in the desert], / the flinty rock into a fountain" (NJV). The geographical movement of Ps 114 from sea (v. 5) to mountains and hill country (v. 6) to desert (vv. 7-8) mirrors precisely that of Psalm 29, for that "most Canaanite" of psalms also moves from sea (vv. 3-4) to mountains (vv. 5-6) to desert (vv. 7-8).

<sup>(39)</sup> See the extensive treatment of at least the and palace motifs in F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge 1973).

texts to his own sufferings, or what he wants to call the sufferings of history<sup>(40)</sup>.

In any case, I prefer, *pace* Clifford, to see in at least some presentations of Yhwh's battles<sup>(41)</sup> a strong, albeit indirect, argument in support of the Baal Cycle's fundamental unity and coherence.

At the same time, it is necessary to offer an interpretation of the cycle on its own terms and in its own context. In my opinion, J. C. L. Gibson's recent study of the cycle's theology is the best currently available, for it treats the myth with the respectful and imaginative sympathy it demands<sup>(42)</sup>. I find myself in substantial agreement with Gibson on (1) his sensibly flexible approach to ancient myths in general; (2) his defense of the unity and arrangement of the Baal myth in particular; and (3) his remarks regarding the place of El in the myth. As he notes, "El is not only above Baal. He exercises the same freedom of action in dealing with his two rivals"<sup>(43)</sup>. Baal's kingship "should therefore be understood in terms of viceregency"<sup>(44)</sup>.

Despite these (and other) areas of agreement, there are nevertheless certain modifications of Gibson's position that I deem necessary.

<sup>(40)</sup> H. BLOOM, *A Map of Misreading* (Oxford 1975) 3-4.

<sup>(41)</sup> We must recognize, of course, that we are not dealing with the imposition of a monolithic pattern from the outside, but the creative manipulation of an originally borrowed, later inherited, pattern. Since Yhwh was seen as supreme in both power and authority, a living God not subject to death (or Death), it is not surprising to find that often, especially in poetic units or subunits focussing exclusively on him, the pattern is broken off after the defeat of sea and the proclamation of God's eternal kingship. It is usually when Israel (or an individual Israelite) becomes involved that an occasion arises to celebrate Yhwh's triumph over death. For example, in the psalm of Jonah 2, it is possible to discern an attenuated reflection of the old Canaanite pattern in the movement of imagery. The suppliant of the psalm is overwhelmed by seas/river (v. 4), cut off from temple/palace (v. 5), forced to descend into the underworld (v. 7). Only when this cycle of despair, an inversion of the Baal Cycle, is complete does Yhwh intervene and restore the psalmist to his holy temple. On a cosmic (and proto-apocalyptic) level, we find a reworking of the old pattern — with specific mention of Death — in the Isaianic Apocalypse (Isaiah 24-27).

<sup>(42)</sup> J. C. L. GIBSON, "The Theology of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle", *Or* 53 (1984) 202-219.

<sup>(43)</sup> GIBSON, "Theology", 208.

<sup>(44)</sup> GIBSON, "Theology", 209.

First, Gibson sees the cycle in its present form as “a mixture of the cosmological and the seasonal”<sup>(45)</sup>. This continued emphasis on the supposedly seasonal aspects in fact contradicts his far more accurate observation that Baal is not a god of fertility, but “in the strictest parlance the wind and weather god of Ugarit’s pantheon”<sup>(46)</sup>. At Ugarit, as elsewhere in Canaan and North Syria, Baal Hadad is first and foremost the deity of the rain-storm and related meteorological phenomena. And rain-storms in those regions are “seasonal” only in the sense that their occurrence is limited to one of the two basic divisions of the year. The storms themselves, however, are discrete entities, rarely lasting more than a few days<sup>(47)</sup>. The eastern Mediterranean coast knows no “rainy season” comparable to that in the tropics, the Pacific Northwest, or coastal Europe.

A second area of disagreement concerns the location of Mot’s realm. Mot does, of course, reside in the “underworld,” into which Baal “goes down”. But Baal is “going down” from Zaphon, and the region he enters is the desert. As de Moor has recognized, “the immediate surroundings of the Nether World were imagined as steppe or desert”<sup>(48)</sup>. In *CTA* 5.5.19 (= *UT* 67:V:19), 5.6.7 (67:VI:7), and 6.2.20 (49:II:20), the transition area between Zaphon and the desert is called *šd.šhl mmt*, “the field(s) on the shore of death’s realm”. This transition zone is thus the vestibule of Mot’s kingdom. The heat and desolation of the latter reflect the conditions of the desert, not the hill country of Canaan, whose infertility in summer is often exaggerated. Only when Mot’s messengers penetrate westward in the guise of the scirocco, do Zaphon and the rest of that hill country become “hellishly” uncomfortable.

Putting these two aspects of Baal and Mot together, I would sug-

<sup>(45)</sup> GIBSON, “Theology”, 211. Gibson readily acknowledges his debt to J. C. DE MOOR’s strong defense of the seasonal aspects of the cycle in *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba’lu* (AOAT 16; Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971), although he rejects de Moor’s reordering of the tablets.

<sup>(46)</sup> GIBSON, “Theology”, 206.

<sup>(47)</sup> The meteorological tables appended to DE MOOR, *Seasonal Pattern*, Tables VIII-XVI (p. 259-268), clearly show that storm-conditions are not “seasonal”, but sporadic, even as far north as Latakia.

<sup>(48)</sup> DE MOOR, *Seasonal Patterns*, 186. A careful comparison of the shared vocabulary of *CTA* 6 (= *UT* 49+62) and *CTA* 23 (*UT* 52) would, I suspect, lend additional support to de Moor’s position.

gest that the cycle as a whole describes not the seasons so much as the inexorable movement of a single rain-storm. Like the rain-storm of 1 Kgs 18,43-45, Baal rises out of the West, battles against (the Mediterranean) Sea, and in triumph reaches the coastal mountains. These are his heritage, and on these his palace is built. But he is enthroned there only for a short time before moving into the realm of Death, toward the great Syrian Desert, the graveyard of so many a Mediterranean storm.

I do not wish to imply that this simple reading of the cycle in any way exhausts its meaning, or excludes a seasonal, or even a sabbatical<sup>(49)</sup>, dimension. Far from it. The people of ancient Ugarit, and of Canaan generally, could follow this same pattern over days, over seasons, over years; and the myth is now constructed in such a way as to reflect these various tiers of natural reality. Indeed, the pattern can be read on other levels. For example, it constitutes a sort of cosmogony, a sacred geography, of the Canaanite world, threatened on the west by a hostile and chaotic sea, on the east by an insatiable, death-dealing desert. In the face of this dual threat, the myth proclaims that Canaan belongs neither to Yamm nor to Mot, but to Baal, the god of the life-giving rains. Even if he is not present, his kingship over Canaan is assured; his legitimate El-sanctioned right to the land of the living, i.e., to Canaan, is symbolized by his divine palace on Zaphon (mirrored, however dimly, by every Baal temple in his earthly realm). Yamm, Baal, and Mot constitute, in effect, a triumvirate controlling the earth, in tension and in balance under El<sup>(50)</sup>. Even the individual human life-cycle mirrors the

<sup>(49)</sup> My colleague, Professor Hanna E. Kassis, has informed me that, while in the Syrian Desert, he encountered a deeply rooted belief in a "sabbatical" desert harvest. That is, every seventh year will (ideally) see rain of a force and duration sufficient not only to penetrate the desert, but also to produce the luxury of one rain-induced harvest in areas normally barren. A comparable belief among ancient Canaanites may well underlie CTA 6.5.11-19 (= UT 49: V: 11-19), where Death is apparently complaining that he and his realm have been forced to undergo the indignities of a harvest, have been invaded by agricultural "life".

<sup>(50)</sup> The extent to which this ordering of the universe reflects Canaanite political realities merits further investigation. Certainly, attempts to read the Mesopotamian imperial ideal of the *Enuma Elish* into the Baal Cycle have been unsuccessful; and I suspect that what we find in the latter is the inverse of the former's triumphal imperialism: the attempt of a perennially client

myth's movement: before life, chaos; after life, death. This pattern, too, is built into the myth. In sum, I would argue that the Baal Cycle, at its simplest level, describes a single winter storm; but I would also argue that, as with myth in general, so with this particular myth: to limit our approach to one level only is to rob it of its religious might, of its very real power to captivate the human imagination and to order human experience.

Having outlined my own approach to the Baal Cycle, I must add that what follows need not depend on wholesale acceptance of this interpretation. Since our immediate goal is to trace the transmission of a particular mythic pattern from Bronze Age Canaan to Hellenistic Judaism, agreement that the following elements were present in the pattern of the former should prove sufficient: (1) Baal's battle with the Sea, which leads to the proclamation of the storm god's kingship; (2) Baal's kingship, which is, and must be, sanctioned by El; and (3) El's own kingship, which is not thereby undermined. With these features of the pattern in mind, let us turn to Psalm 89.

### III. The Two Faces of Psalm 89

It has long been recognized that Psalm 89 is linked to both the Baal Cycle and Daniel 7, but thus far only Yhwh's defeat of the sea and allied forces in vv. 10-11 has been seen to form part of the chain of transmission from the Canaanite myth to the Jewish vision<sup>(51)</sup>. And even this link is regularly submerged in a catena of references to biblical texts mentioning the defeat of sea and related monsters. The position I shall attempt to defend here is that such a limited use of Psalm 89 is woefully inadequate, indeed that the psalm shares with both Ugarit and Daniel not merely an isolated image or motif, but that very pattern which allows us to move from the one to the other.

---

region to claim for itself not absolute control of its own destiny, but at least an important place in the cosmic order. El, like an Egyptian king, is at once distant and authoritative; and Baal's viceregency is not entirely removed from the coregency that was the norm in Middle Kingdom Egypt. In any case, the political dimensions of the cycle deserve careful study.

<sup>(51)</sup> See, e.g., HARTMAN and DI LELLA, *Daniel*, 212; COLLINS, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 96.



The psalm itself is generally divided into three parts: (1) a hymn celebrating Yhwh's creative activity and kingship (vv. 2-3, 6-19); (2) a royal oracle (or royal grant) in which Yhwh promises, under oath, to give to David and his line an everlasting dominion over the kings of the earth (vv. 4-5, 20-38); and (3) a lament reflecting some still debated situation in which that dominion is mortally threatened (vv. 39-52). Although it was once fashionable to view hymn, oracle, and lament as originally distinct compositions fused together by a later editor (or editors), in recent decades the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction<sup>(52)</sup>. It is now widely conceded that at least the hymnic and oracular sections were integrated from the first, as the interlocking structure of vv. 2-38 clearly indicates (vv. 2-3 : 4-5 : 6-19 : 20-38)<sup>(53)</sup>. Since the patterned movement I discern in the psalm extends over hymn and oracle, it offers additional confirmation of the original unity of at least these two sections.

Let us look first at the hymn. The body of the hymn opens with a celebration of Yhwh's incomparability in the heavenly "assembly of holy beings" (*biqhal qēdōšīm*, v. 6), "among the divine beings" (*bibnē 'ēlīm*, v. 7). This primacy is immediately grounded in Yhwh's control over "the swelling of the sea" (*gē'ūt hayyām*, v. 10), the result of his defeat of Rahab and related enemies (*'ōyēbekā*, v. 11). From this primeval victory we move to the establishment of the world, with a direct or indirect allusion to Zaphon (*šāpôn*, v. 13)<sup>(54)</sup>, a description of the divine throne (v. 15), and the

<sup>(52)</sup> See already O. EISSFELDT, "The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5", *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in honor of James Muilenburg* (eds. B. W. ANDERSON and W. HARRELSON) (New York 1962) 196-207, esp. 197-198, who defends the "literary unity" of the psalm. N. M. SARNA, "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis", *Biblical and Other Studies* (ed. A. ALTMANN) (Cambridge 1963) 29-46, esp. 30-33, prefers to posit "a single creative editor-psalmist" who, after fusing hymn and oracle, composed the lament.

<sup>(53)</sup> See especially J. B. DUMORTIER's cogent and perceptive analysis, "Un rituel d'intronisation: Le Ps. LXXXIX 2-38", *VT* 22 (1972) 176-196. Like Dumortier, I am inclined to see the lament as a later addition; but I would also insist that it was never an independent work. It was intended from the first to follow vv. 2-38.

<sup>(54)</sup> DAHOOD, *Psalms II* (AB 17; Garden City 1968) 314, with references and CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 135, n. 79, prefer to read "Zaphon and Aman-

reaction of Yhwh's people, Israel. This last culminates in the shout of v. 19:

Truly Yhwh is our shield,  
truly the Holy One of Israel our King<sup>(55)</sup>.

Once due allowance is made for the differences between hymnic and mythic chronology, it is obvious that Ps 89,6-19 reflects the patterned movement of the Baal Cycle: revolt and defeat of Yamm, the movement of the storm god to Zaphon, Baal's enthronement there, and the proclamation of his kingship.

At the same time, when we allow for the inevitable differences between Psalm 89's hymnic merging of past and present, on the one hand, and the apocalyptic future of the vision in Daniel 7, on the other, the links between hymn and vision are equally obvious. Out of the wind-stirred "great sea", which recalls the "swelling of the sea" in Ps 89,10, come four beasts reminiscent of Rahab and the other "enemies" of the psalm. If the psalm (v. 18) sees Israel's horn as exalted, in the vision (v. 8) the horn imagery is inverted: the little horn of the fourth beast arrogantly exalts itself. In the vision (vv. 9-10) thrones are then placed, and the "Ancient of Days" takes his seat with his angelic courtiers standing in attendance. The throne of the primeval judge in Daniel mirrors the throne of Ps 89,15a, whose base is "righteousness and justice", even as the attendant angels recall the divine council of Ps 89,6-8 and 15b. In the psalm (v. 11) Rahab is crushed "like a corpse" (*keḥālāl*), and its followers scattered; in the vision the fourth beast is killed and "its corpse" (*gišmah*) burnt (v. 11), while the other beasts, dominionless, survive "for a time and a season" (v. 12).

It must be admitted that Psalm 89 has clear and numerous ties to both the Baal Cycle and Daniel 7. However, we must also rec-

---

us" in place of MT's "North and South". The emendation is attractive, but not necessary, for the psalmist may simply be playing on the dual associations of *šāpôn*.

(<sup>55</sup>) DAHOOD, *Psalms II*, 315, with references, and CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 161 and n. 72, are surely right to read the *lameds* of v. 19 as emphatic. On asseverative *lamed*, see also R. J. WILLIAMS, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline* (Toronto - Buffalo <sup>2</sup>1976) 50-51, § 283. Such a reading becomes all the more attractive when we realize that nowhere else in the psalm is the Davidic ruler called "king".

ognize its discontinuities with both. The Israelite hymn, while it mirrors the Canaanite pattern in imagery and motifs, at the same time shatters its ideological bases. For Yhwh in the hymn is no storm god who must integrate himself into a complex universe. His authority is absolute, and he rules the heavens (vv. 6-9), the sea (vv. 10-11), and the earth (vv. 12-13) without rival. He has absorbed into himself the victory (vv. 10-11) and might (v. 14) of Canaanite Baal, as well as the creative power (vv. 12-13) and authoritative role in the divine council (vv. 6-8) usually associated with Canaanite El<sup>(56)</sup>. In Psalm 89 there is only one divine King.

On this basic issue of Yhwh's absolute sovereignty, Daniel 7 agrees with Psalm 89. The vision, however, transforms the battlefield of the psalm into a courtroom. The shift from divine warrior to divine judge may well be a reflex of the metamorphosis of *Urzeit* into *Endzeit*. That is, the primeval sea and allied monsters were often presented as independent or quasi-independent powers. They suffered the fate of defeated enemies: they were slain in battle or imprisoned. The apocalyptic fourth beast, however, is a rebellious subject of a kingdom already long established. As such it is judged, and its fate is that of a criminal: it is executed and its corpse desecrated<sup>(57)</sup>. Thus the image of the divine judge, already implicit in Ps 89,6-8 and 15, comes to dominate the later vision, even as the image of the divine warrior recedes into the primeval background.

Our reading of the hymnic section of Psalm 89 does, I think, establish for it an important role in the transmission of a pattern. Nevertheless, the hymn by itself cannot resolve the dilemma posed by "one like a son of man" and his role in Daniel 7, for in the hymn the Baal-figure who should lie behind the one who "comes with the clouds of heaven" has been totally assimilated to Yhwh-El. To put the problem differently, we can trace one complex of motifs from Canaanite El through Yhwh-El of Ps 89,6-19 to the "Ancient of Days" of Daniel 7; but where in Psalm 89 is the missing link between Baal and "one like a son of man", the link which would

(<sup>56</sup>) El's role as creator, though less prominent in the Baal Cycle than his role in the divine assembly, is nevertheless clearly reflected in his epithet *bn y bnwt*, "creator of creatures" (CTA 4.2.11 [=UT 51:II:11]; 6.3.5 [= UT 49:III:5]); cf. also 'l qn 'rṣ, "El, creator of earth", in KAI 26 A III.18; 129.1.

(<sup>57</sup>) See above, n. 29.

complete the pattern? To answer this question, we must be prepared to move beyond the confines of the hymn and into the royal oracle.

In an earlier study, I suggested that "David himself, in the first half of the royal oracle (vv. 20-28), is described in hyperbolic mythico-religious terms"<sup>(58)</sup>. Here I would go even further and suggest that, especially in vv. 26-28, David is in a sense invited to play Baal to Yhwh's El. For David, like Baal, gains dominion over "sea" and (recalling Yamm's parallel name, Nahar) "rivers":

"I will set his hand upon the sea,  
his right hand upon the rivers" (v. 26; *NJV*)<sup>(59)</sup>.

In Psalm 89 this dominion presages a new relationship to the divine king, one of adoptive sonship. God now becomes "my father" ('*ābī*, v. 27), and David now the "first-born son" (*bēkôr*, v. 28). Just so, Baal, who is elsewhere regularly "the son of Dagan" (*bn dgn*), is called "his [El's] son" (*bnh*), with El now "my [Baal's] father" ('*aby*), after his defeat of Yamm and in conjunction with the acknowledgement of his kingship or viceregency (*CTA* 3.E.2 [= *UT* 'nt: pl. vi: IV: 2]; 43, 47-48 ['nt V: 43.47-48]). Moreover, David's new title, "most high" ('*elyôn*) to the kings of the earth", recalls Baal's epithet "most high" ('*ly*, *CTA* 16.3.6, 8 [= *UT* 126: III: 6,8])<sup>(60)</sup>. Lastly, the dominion of the Davidic line is to be

<sup>(58)</sup> "Once Again the Heavenly Witness of Ps. 89: 38", *JBL* 105 (1986) 27-37, esp. 33.

<sup>(59)</sup> The mythological overtones of "sea" and "rivers" in this verse have been noted by G. AHLSTRÖM, *Psalm 89. Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden Königs* (Lund 1959) 108-111; DAHOOD, *Psalms II*, 317; and DUMORTIER, "Un rituel d'intronisation", 188 and n. 1, among others.

This mythological dimension need not exclude an oblique historical-geographical allusion to the boundaries of the Davidic empire (so S. MOWINCKEL, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* [2 vols.; Nashville 1962] I, 55).

<sup>(60)</sup> On reconstructed '*ly* in biblical texts (including 1 Sam 2,10), see M. DAHOOD, "The Divine Name '*Ēlī* in the Psalms", *TS* 14 (1953) 452-457. Note, too, that Hebrew '*elyôn* as a divine title occurs often in connection with Yhwh's storm theophanies; see 2 Sam 22,14 = Ps 18,14; Isa 14,14; Ps 46,5 (note v. 7); 77,11 (note vv. 17-20). In 2 Sam 22 = Ps 18, the Baal imagery is overwhelming. Not only do we find storm clouds, thunder, and lightning surrounding '*elyôn*; but the very movement of vv. 5-18 is a clear inversion of the Baal Cycle's: threat of death (vv. 5-6), appeal to temple/palace

an eternal one (so repeatedly in vv. 29-38), even as Baal's (CTA 2.4.10 [= UT 68:10])<sup>(61)</sup>. Here in the royal oracle of Psalm 89 we find what is surely one of the most grandiose conceptions of Davidic rule. The oracle's debt to Canaanite myth is unmistakable, and the implicit comparison between David and Baal breathtaking in its daring. And yet.

And yet the comparison is really little more than a literary conceit, a way of underscoring the cosmic importance of the Davidic monarch. The psalmist himself most effectively undermines any attempt to push the comparison too far. To begin with, despite the Baal titles accorded him, David is no "divine king". He is not divine, for he lacks immortality, the *sine qua non* of divinity (including Baal's, as CTA 17.6.26-38 [= UT 2 *Aqht*: VI: 26-38] makes clear). Throughout the royal oracle, David's mortality is implicit. Vv. 29-38, which talk of throne and lineage, are permeated by talk of "eternity" ('*ôlām* and synonyms); but such language is entirely absent in vv. 20-28, which focus on the person of David.

Not only is David not divine. He is not even "king". Not once in Psalm 89's "royal" oracle is the root *mlk* used in connection with David or his line. David, and by implication each of his successors, is repeatedly titled simply "my servant" ('*abdī*, vv. 4, 21). This passivity of David is emphasized in other ways. For example, it is Yhwh alone who defeats both sea (vv. 10-11) and

---

(v. 7), storm theophany of Yhwh (vv. 8-15), defeat of the *mayim rabbīm* (vv. 16-18).

The combined weight of the Hebrew and Ugaritic evidence for '*ly*/'*elyōn* as a Baal title justifies, I think, our equating Sefire's '*l w'lyn* (KAI 222 A.11) with El and Hadad / Anu and Adad. Note also the juxtaposition of El and Elyon in Isa 14,13-14. The omission of the *waw* from Gen 14,18-22's (*yhw*) '*ēl 'elyōn* may well reflect a theological claim that the one Israelite God can do the work of two Canaanite deities. (The position sketched here has been anticipated in part by G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, "El 'Elyon in Genesis 14,18-20", *JBL* 63 [1944] 1-9; for a radically different reconstruction, see M. L. BARRÉ, *The God-List in the Treaty between Hannibal and Philip V of Macedonia* [JHNES; Baltimore-London 1983] 25-30. I hope to return to El, Elyon, and Isa 14,13-14 in a future study.)

(61) Note also the similarity between "I will establish ['*ākīn*] your offspring forever" (Ps 89,5) and the reference to "El the king who established him [*dyknnh*]" (CTA 3.E.44 = 4.4.48 [= UT '*nt* V: 44: = 51: IV: 48]). The echo of CTA 3.D.49-50 (= UT '*nt* IV: 49-50) in Ps 89,23 was already noted by DAHOOD, *Psalms II*, 317.

David's enemies (vv. 23-24). David here is no warrior. He does not win his dominion; he is given it. And he himself is to acknowledge this in language that reverses Baal's. For in the Ugaritic cycle, once Yamm is defeated, Baal continues on to "my rock divine Zaphon, . . . the rock of my heritage, . . . the hill of (my) victory" (*gry 'il špn. . . gr nhlty. . . gb' tl'iyt*, CTA 3.C.26-28 [= UT 'nt: III: 26-28]). In Psalm 89, after receiving dominion over sea and rivers, David is to confess his total dependence on Yhwh, calling him "my God, the rock of my victory" (*'ēlī wēšūr yēšū' ātī*, v. 27b).

In short, the psalmist has compared David to Baal, but reduced the comparison from the mythic level to the artificial. By comparing David implicitly to Baal, he has exalted David above all the kings of the earth; but by demonstrating David's total dependence upon Yhwh, he has implicitly denigrated Baal's claim to cosmic kingship and power.

When we turn from Ugarit to Daniel 7, we find that the latter's connections to the oracle of Psalm 89 are equally apparent. First, the two biblical texts share a contextual similarity, in that the royal oracle is said to have been spoken "in a vision to your faithful ones" (*bēhāzôn laḥsīdekā*, v. 20; cf. 2 Sam 7,17). More importantly, Daniel 7 shares with Psalm 89 the same breaking of the Canaanite pattern in that the role assigned to the "one like a son of man" is essentially passive. Just as Yhwh-El defeats sea and allies (in battle) before transferring control of these to David so, too, in the vision of Daniel 7, the "Ancient of Days" presides (in court) over the execution of the fourth beast and the removal of dominion from the other three before that dominion is transferred to the "one like a son of man". Like David, the one who "comes with the clouds of heaven" is not even present for the cosmic confrontation, but passively receives the fruits thereof: a dominion whose eternal character is repeatedly emphasized in both texts. Even Daniel 7's reference to "the clouds of heaven" (*'im- 'ānānē šēmayyā*, v. 13) finds a counterpart in the psalm's "enduring witness in the cloud(s)" (*baššahaq*, v. 38)<sup>(62)</sup>.

<sup>(62)</sup> The *baššahaq* of Ps 89,38 echoes the earlier *baššahaq* of v. 7: "Who in the cloud(s) can compare to Yhwh?". In my study on v. 38 (see above, n. 58), I argue that within the context of the psalm the witness must be identified as the Davidic throne itself, which, though impersonal, is quasi-divinized by the granting of immortality and therefore resident forever in heav-

Finally, if we include in our purview not only the vision of Daniel, but also its subsequent interpretation, additional links with Psalm 89 can be discerned. For example, the shift in the psalm from Yhwh's primeval enemies (vv. 10-11) to David's historical enemies (vv. 23-24) is matched in Daniel 7 by the shift from symbolic cosmic enemies in the vision to their historical embodiments, the four earthly kingdoms, in the interpretation. Lastly, the interpretative section of Daniel 7 equates the "one like a son of man" with the *qaddišê 'elyônîn* (vv. 18.22.25) or the *'am qaddišê 'elyônîn* (v. 27). However we interpret these much debated phrases within the context of Daniel 7, the phrases certainly echo David's new title *'elyôn* in Ps 89,28, a title conferred only after he has been anointed "with my holy oil" (*běšemen qodšî*, v. 21).

At this point we are in danger of overstepping the limits set for the present study, which is concerned with tracing the history of a mythic pattern, with its associated images and motifs. I think enough has been said to establish that Psalm 89 is an important stage on the long road from Bronze Age Canaan to the Hellenistic-Jewish world of Daniel 7, that the psalmist — surely one of Bloom's "strong readers" — has received and substantially modified a quintessentially Canaanite mythic pattern before passing on to later generations a quintessentially Israelite pattern. The relevance of this prehistory to the exegesis proper of Daniel 7 — and I believe it is very relevant indeed — must be left to another occasion. However, before bringing this study to a close, I should like to fit into position one other piece of this prehistory, namely, the "son of man" and his entry into the pattern.

#### IV. Psalm 8: The "Son of Man" as King

In Daniel 7 the one who receives eternal kingship and dominion is not the David of Psalm 89, but "one like a son of man". It has

---

en/Zion. However, I would also argue that this contextual identification was ignored in later "creative misreadings" of the psalm. The witness was quickly personalized, embodied first in David (Isa 55,4; on the many other echoes of Ps 89 in Deutero-Isaiah, see the study of Eissfeldt cited in n. 52), then in the "one like a son of man" (Dan 7,13), and eventually in "Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead, and the ruler of kings on earth" (Rev 1,5; *RSV*).

often been rightly noted that the humanity of this figure stands in stark contrast to the four unnatural beasts that have risen out of the "great sea". But can this humanity be associated with our mythic pattern, or is it drawn from an unrelated source? I would suggest that the author of Daniel was not creating such an association *de novo*, but found it ready-made in Psalm 8.

That the "son of man/son of Adam" (*ben-'ādām*, v. 5b) in Psalm 8 is conceived of in royal terms has never been in doubt<sup>(63)</sup>. He is crowned with royal glory and majesty (v. 6) and given dominion over creation (vv. 7-9). The theme of kingship thus links Psalm 8 to both Psalm 89 and Daniel 7. But this thematic linkage expands into a full-fledged parallelism of pattern if we are prepared to identify God's foes, subdued in Ps 8,3, with the primeval waters and/or associated monsters.

Such an equation has already been defended by Mitchell Dahood<sup>(64)</sup> and J. Alberto Soggin<sup>(65)</sup>, and I find it unavoidable. To identify "enemy and avenger" with the human foes of God (or Israel) destroys the unity of the poem; the idyllic view of *ben-'ādām*'s position in the universe — even if it be only a past or future ideal — simply will not fit such a reading. If, however, these foes are the primeval waters, imprisoned since creation behind the firmament (cf. Ps 104,8), then v. 3 flows naturally, logically into v. 4: "When I look at your heavens..."<sup>(66)</sup>.

The movement in Psalm 8 from *Chaoskampf* to kingship which this reading of v. 3 reveals recalls, of course, the parallel pattern in

<sup>(63)</sup> I do not, of course, mean to imply that Psalm 8 was ever a "royal psalm" in any technical sense, nor that *ben 'ādām* was ever a royal title. Rather, the psalmist has "democratized" the office of king. If, in the future dreamt of by Deutero-Isaiah, all faithful Israelites will fall heir to the promises of the Davidic covenant (see preceding note), for the psalmist all human beings are, at least ideally, royal figures, God's viceregents on earth.

<sup>(64)</sup> M. DAHOOD, *Psalms I* (AB 16; Garden City 1966) 50-51. See also A. A. ANDERSON, *The Book of Psalms* (NCeB; Grand Rapids - London 1981) I, 102, who cautiously follows Dahood.

<sup>(65)</sup> J. A. SOGGIN, "Salmo 8,3: Osservazioni filologico-esegetiche", *Bib* 47 (1966) 420-424; "Zum achten Psalm", *ASTI* 8 (1970-71) 106-122, esp. 113-114; "Textkritische Untersuchung von Ps. VIII vv. 2-3 und 6", *VT* 21 (1971) 565-571, esp. 569-570.

<sup>(66)</sup> There may even be a pun involving v. 3's *lēšašbīt*, "to quiet", and the *šabbāt* that crowns creation in Gen 2,2-3.



Psalm 89. The similarities of Psalm 8 to Daniel 7, however, become truly staggering. "When I look at your heavens" — this is in effect what Daniel is doing in his vision, looking at the heavens and seeing there not the defeat of the primeval foe, but the execution of the apocalyptic enemy. Only after this execution is kingship given to "one like a son of man". And if in Psalm 8 *ben-'ādām* receives dominion over "the wild beasts" (*bahāmôt šādāy*, v. 7), in Daniel 7 the one who is *kēbar 'ēnāš* receives an everlasting dominion that extends over the three surviving "great beasts" (*hēwātā' rabrēbātā'*, v. 17; cf. v. 12). Finally, the positioning of the "one like a son of man" among "the clouds of heaven" echoes the status of the "son of man" in Ps 8,6: "little less than divine: (*mē'at me'ēlōhīm*).

Once more we have reached the limits set for this essay. Beyond these and into an exegesis of Daniel 7 we shall not venture here. If we have succeeded in clarifying the history of a mythic pattern from its earliest known appearance in Bronze Age Canaan, through its Israelite transformations as these are reflected in Psalms 89 and 8, and down to the threshold of Daniel 7, we have accomplished our purpose. Let it serve as a sort of "*praeparatio danielica*".

Department of Religious Studies  
University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5

Paul G. MOSCA

## SOMMAIRE

La présente étude a pour but de clarifier la préhistoire, cananéenne et israélite, de l'imagerie complexe qu'on trouve dans le rêve visionnaire de Dn 7,1-14, et spécialement aux vv. 9-14. L'article réaffirme d'abord l'unité du cycle ugaritique de Baal et l'importance de son modèle mythique pour les transformations israélites postérieures de celui-ci. Puis il soutient la thèse suivante: le Ps 89 représente une étape importante sur la longue route qui va du cycle de Baal à Dn 7. Plus spécialement, la présentation que le Ps 89 fait de David en termes mythico-religieux hyperboliques («très haut», «fils premier-né», etc.) constitue une étape intermédiaire entre le Baal de l'âge du bronze et le personnage «comme un fils d'homme» judéo-hellénistique.

## ANIMADVERSIONES

---

### “And the Lord Turned and Looked Straight at Peter”: Understanding Luke 22,61

---

The Lukan addition of the detail that immediately after the cockcrow Jesus turned and looked at Peter subtly differs from the story in Mark. There is nothing in Mark's version of the denials of Peter that even approximates Luke's indication that Jesus looked at Peter at the conclusion of Peter's exchanges with those in the courtyard of the high priest. In Mark's account Jesus is above the courtyard in the council hall of the Jewish leaders, and no visual contact is mentioned or presumably possible. Moreover, in Mark 14,72 the cockcrow itself stirs Peter's memory and moves him to break down (*epiballein*?) and cry; but in Luke the cockcrow becomes confirmation of Jesus' prediction concerning Peter's denial. In Luke Jesus' look, not the cockcrow, causes Peter's going out and weeping bitterly.

How is one to account for this difference, or better, what does Luke mean to say happened in the courtyard of the high priest? As for the meaning of the story, there are at least three ways to understand how Jesus was in a position to look at Peter. First, he was being moved from one place to another<sup>(1)</sup>. This explanation seems unlikely in the Lukan arrangement of the scenes where Jesus is mocked by those in charge of him immediately after Peter goes out and weeps. It does not appear that he is being moved at this point in the story. Second, Jesus looked out from above through an open window at Peter<sup>(2)</sup>. This understanding stems from the harmonization of Luke and Mark, for in Luke's narrative nothing indicates that Jesus is inside the house. Third, Jesus is being held in the courtyard prior to his being led before the Assembly. This interpretation seems preferable since (a) it is not in conflict with anything in Luke's account and (b) there is no need to supply information that is not explicit in Luke's story.

This conclusion raises a second question, namely, how is one to account for the detail of Jesus' turning in Luke 22,61? Scholars usually understand Luke 22,61a either to be a Lukan composition<sup>(3)</sup> or to stem from a pre-Lukan source<sup>(4)</sup>. One may add to these two possibilities that 22,61a may

(1) I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI 1978) 844.

(2) E. SCHWEIZER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen 1982) 231.

(3) R. BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York 1963 [German original 1921]) 269, 283.

(4) D. R. CATCHPOLE, *The Trial of Jesus: A Study of the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day* (Studia Post-Biblica 18; Leiden 1971) 168-169.

betray the influence of oral tradition. It seems best, however, to understand 22,61a as a piece of Lukan composition. There is no similar tradition in another known source to indicate the influence of oral tradition. This does not completely rule out the possibility that this information comes from oral tradition, but no basis exists for such an interpretation, for there is nothing in 22,61a to suggest that Luke depends on a pre-Lukan source. Indeed, the converse appears to be true. In saying that Jesus turned (*strephein*) toward Peter, and by having Jesus' gaze motivate Peter's remembrance of Jesus' prophecy, Luke employs typical vocabulary and develops characteristic thoughts.

Luke uses the verb *strephein* seven times in the Gospel (7,9.44; 9,55; 10,23; 14,25; 22,61; 23,28) and three times in Acts. Although the word can simply mean physical turning toward someone or something, the only subject of this verb in Luke's Gospel is Jesus. Furthermore, there is theological importance in the three uses of *strephein* in Acts. At 7,39 the fathers of Israel are said to have refused to obey God and to have *turned* to Egypt. Then at 7,42 one reads that *God turned* and gave them over to the worship of the host of heaven. Finally, at Acts 13,46, after Paul and Barnabas are reviled by certain Jews, they say, "Behold, we *turn* to the Gentiles". Plausibly, then, *to turn* is to act positively or negatively with regard to the will of God; and so, at Luke 22,61a Jesus' *turning* to Peter may be significant activity in the planned way of God.

By way of general comparison of the Passion Narratives in the Gospels of Mark and Luke, one sees that in Luke's account, Jesus is more active than in Mark's story: Jesus issues the command for the preparation of the Last Supper (22,8); he conducts the meal in a more formal fashion (22,15-16.24-38); he leads the disciples out from the upper room to the Mount of Olives (22,39); he confronts Judas (22,48); he reproves his disciples when they act on their own initiative (22,51); he heals the ear of his wounded opponent (22,51); he stands steadfast throughout his being abused and interrogated (22,63-23,12); he prophesies on the way to the cross (23,28-31); he gives assurance of salvation even while dying (23,42-43). In and through all that happens, Jesus trusts God absolutely and acts boldly based upon his trust. Thus, from this consideration of Luke 22,61a, especially in the context of the Passion Narrative, one seems safest to understand that Luke composed this line in order to show Jesus acting in an authoritative manner, a characteristic Lukan concern—especially in the Passion Narrative<sup>(5)</sup>.

United Theological Seminary  
1810 Howard Blvd.  
Dayton, Ohio 45406  
U.S.A.

Marion L. SOARDS

---

<sup>(5)</sup> The line of interpretation of Luke 22 is pursued in detail in M. L. SOARDS, *The Passion according to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield 1986).

## Paul's Double Critique of Jewish Boasting: A Study of Rom 3,27 in Its Context\*

In Rom 3,27 Paul asks, "What then becomes of boasting?". He categorically answers that it has been excluded and suggests a possible means for this exclusion: a (law of) works<sup>(1)</sup>. But Paul rejects this possibility and proclaims that, on the contrary, boasting has been excluded through a law of faith. In v. 28 he recapitulates his essential teaching on righteousness through faith as the ground for the exclusion of boasting<sup>(2)</sup>.

Rom 3,27 is a highly charged and remarkably compact summary of much of Paul's preceding argument in Rom 2 and 3. In order to understand

\* This article is based on part of my doctoral dissertation, "*We Uphold the Law*". *A Study of Rom 3,31 and Its Context* (K. U. Leuven: Unpubl. Ph. D. Dissertation 1985). For a somewhat complementary view of Rom 3,27 (and 4,2), see the short study by my dissertation director, J. LAMBRECHT, "Why Is Boasting Excluded? A Note on Rom 3,27 and 4,2", *ETL* 61 (1985) 365-369.

<sup>(1)</sup> One must take τῶν ἔργων as an ellipsis for νόμος τῶν ἔργων; see e.g. C.E.B. CRANFIELD, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1975-79) I, 219 and O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK 4; Göttingen 1978) 155.

νόμος τῶν ἔργων here is to be understood in as the Mosaic law while νόμος πίστεως should be taken in the metaphorical sense, "rule" or "order" of faith. Some understand both occurrences of νόμος here as the Torah; see e.g. the important article of G. FRIEDRICH, "Das 'Gesetz des Glaubens' (Röm 3,27)", *TZ* 10 (1954) 401-417; the position is taken up more recently in C.T. RHYNE, *Faith Establishes the Law* (SBLDS 55; Chico 1981) 68-70 and also in E. J. SCHNABEL, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul* (WUNT 2/16; Tübingen 1985) 285-288. In our view, however, ποῖος already indicates that νόμος here may have a metaphorical sense. Furthermore, 3,28 grounds 3,27 (see following note) and simplifies the terminology: one is justified simply by "faith", not by the Torah; see the excellent study by H. RÄISÄNEN, "Das 'Gesetz des Glaubens' (Röm 3,27) und das 'Gesetz des Geistes' (Röm 8,2)", *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 101-117; see also below, Section F.

For recent studies on Rom 2 and 3, see K.R. SNODGRASS, "Justification by Grace - to the Doers: An Analysis of the Place of Romans 2 in the Theology of Paul", *NTS* 32 (1986) 72-93; and H. RÄISÄNEN, "Zum Verständnis von Röm 3,1-8", *Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* 10 (1985) 93-108.

<sup>(2)</sup> γάρ is to be preferred to οὖν in 3,28 for internal rather than external considerations; v. 28 must give a reason for the thesis of v. 27 rather than a conclusion drawn from it; see B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York 1971) 509; see also U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK 6; Cologne 1978-82) I, 247, n. 768; CRANFIELD, *Romans*, I, 220, n. 4; J. MURRAY, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1959) I, 123; H. RIDDERBOS, *Aan de Romeinen* (Kampen 1959) 89; C. K. BARRETT, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London 1957) 82.

the full import of this verse we will focus on the following problems within it: the significance of the particle οὖν, the meaning of the word "boasting", the double argument against boasting which Paul employs, and finally the shift in the line of thought as indicated by the οὐχί, ἀλλά construction.

#### A. *The Significance of the Particle οὖν*

While Rom 3,27 has attracted much attention in Pauline circles the focus has often centered on the term "boasting". Less attention, however, has been given to the clear indication that what Paul says about boasting and the law of faith in 3,27 directly follows from his immediately previous argumentation. Käsemann, for example, states: "This section (3,27-31) does not draw inferences"<sup>(3)</sup>. But isn't this precisely what it does do<sup>(4)</sup>? Our first clue to Rom 3,27 as drawing an inference from the preceding material is the particle οὖν.

No one would disagree that the normal function of οὖν in discourse is "inferential, denoting that what it introduces is the result of or an inference from what precedes"<sup>(5)</sup>. Denniston remarks that this kind of use is "too common to need illustration"<sup>(6)</sup>. But the nuance which this particle brings to Rom 3,27 is not often noted. To stress the force of the inferential character of the initial question of 3,27, we might paraphrase it: Now, in the light of what has already been said, where is that boasting? οὖν alerts the reader to keep the preceding section in mind when reading 3,27. But just how much of the preceding section is assumed into the οὖν of 3,27?

Surely οὖν draws especially on 3,21-26. Is more of Paul's argument included in the scope of 3,27? Paul does not leave us in doubt here, but indicates how far back in his argument he wishes to go by resuming the topic "boasting", which first occurred at 2,17. These two data together — the use of οὖν and the resumption of the term boasting — encourage us to take the whole argument of 2,17 up to 3,26 into account when deciphering Rom 3,27. We shall see that Rom 3,27 is a concluding and summarizing statement of the elaborate double critique of the boasting of the Jews which Paul has more fully developed in 2,17-3,26. But first, what "boasting" is Paul talking about?

<sup>(3)</sup> E. KÄSEMAN, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids 1980) 102.

<sup>(4)</sup> See, e.g. O. KUSS, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg 1957-78) I, 175: "V. 27a ist durch das Vorangehende wie durch das unmittelbar Folgende (VV. 27.28) begründet. Die VV. 21-26 haben vorwiegend von dem objektiven Heilswerk Gottes gesprochen...; jetzt verlagert sich der Ton stärker auf die Aneignung der Frucht dieses göttlichen Heilswerkes durch Glauben"; see also R. PESCH, *Römerbrief* (Neue Echter Bibel 6; Würzburg 1983) 42; MICHEL, *Römer*, 154; CRANFIELD, *Romans*, I, 219.

<sup>(5)</sup> BAGD, 593.

<sup>(6)</sup> J. D. DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1970) 426.

### B. *The Meaning and Background of "Boasting" in 3,27*

Boasting in Rom 3,27 does not refer to a general attitude of willful arrogance before God but rather refers to the Jews' confidence in a privileged status with God based on their possession of the law. Broader characterizations of the boasting in Rom 3,27 have nonetheless been proposed. Phrases such as "any human boasting" (7), "the attitude of the natural man" (8), "any vestige of self-centered satisfaction" (9), "any place for human pride" (10) can be found in comments on this verse. Occasionally the scope of the boasting in Rom 3,27 is limited to the Jews (rather than applied to all humanity) but is still understood as referring to a generic Jewish trait rather than to a specific pride or confidence in status. J. C. Beker, for example, writes:

The Jew highlights sin in its most demonic aspect, because he believes that in observing the Torah he exhibits a true zeal for God... Paul calls this phenomenon boasting (11).

The problem with these and other similar interpretations of boasting in Rom 3,27 can be seen when one attends to the context of the verse. The particle οὖν has already specified Paul's statement about boasting as following from his preceding argumentation. Further limitations of the notion of boasting

(7) J. REUMANN, "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God: Pauline Reinterpretation in Romans 3:21-31", *Int* 20 (1966) 432-452, 450.

(8) BARRETT, *Romans*, 82.

(9) C. H. GIBLIN, *In Hope of God's Glory. Pauline Theological Perspectives* (New York 1970) 354.

(10) D. COGGAN, *Paul. Portrait of a Revolutionary* (London 1984) 64; see further H.-C. HAHN, "Boast", *DNTT* (1975) 227-229, 228: "Through the 'law of faith' all human glory is of no account... [Boasting is] the teaching that man's original sin consists in glorifying himself and not giving God his due"; or J. PATTRAPANKAL, *Metanoia, Faith, Covenant. A Study in Pauline Theology* (Bangalore 1971) 177; in Rom 3,27 "man is deprived of his tendency to boasting". One exegesis of Rom 2-3 (according to which Paul is "strongly" concerned about peacemaking) cites contemporary nuclear buildup as an example of the "self-righteous boasting" Paul speaks about in Rom 2-3; see G. STASSEN, "A Theological Rationale for Peacemaking", *RevExp* 79 (1982) 623-637, 626-627.

(11) J. C. BEKER, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*, (Philadelphia 1980) 82. This boasting is further described as the Jews' "proud self-awareness of their moral stature and achievement". (Beker also sees boasting as a feeling of superiority to the Gentile because of God's prior election.) For similar evaluations of boasting see, among others, A. VAN DÜLMEN, *Die Theologie des Gesetzes bei Paulus* (SBM 5; Stuttgart 1968) 86; J. CAMBIER, *L'Évangile de Dieu selon l'épître aux romains. Exégèse et théologie biblique. 1: L'Évangile de la justice et de la grâce* (StNeo 3; Bruges 1967) 148; MURRAY, *Romans*, I, 122; RIDDERBOS, *Romeinen*, 87; A. M. HUNTER, *The Epistle to the Romans* (TBC; London 1955) 48. Much of this approach to boasting goes back to R. BULTMANN, "καυχᾶσθαι", *TDNT* 3 (1965) 645-654, who see Paul's using boasting to disclose "the basic attitude of the Jew to be one of self-confidence which seeks glory before God and which relies upon itself". Bultmann includes Rom 3,27 in the discussion. For recent remarks against Bultmann, see H. RÄISÄNEN, *Paul and the Law* (WUNT 29; Tübingen 1983) 171-172.

can be found when one realizes that the term has already appeared in 2,17.23 and thus must take up the discussion there as well<sup>(12)</sup>.

In 2,17 Paul addresses his Jewish audience in a series of descriptive phrases: "You (a) call yourself a Jew and (b) rely on the law and (c) boast of your relation to God". In commenting on this text exegetes are correct in not necessarily understanding the boasting spoken of here to refer to some negative or inappropriate reality. On the contrary, OT and Jewish texts are often cited which indicate what proper boasting is and which might even be taken to support this boasting as something admirable (e.g. among others, Jer 9,23-24; Ps Sol 17,1; Isa 45,25). Particularly in view of some exegetes' extremely critical views of boasting in 3,27, it is interesting to note their comments on 2,17. Murray, for example, states: "Glorying in God was in itself the epitome of true worship (cf. Isa. 45:25; Jer. 9:24; I Cor. 1:31)"<sup>(13)</sup>. Rom 2,17, then, need not necessarily be considered a statement about an arrogant, self-righteous attitude on the part of the Jews. It has respected antecedents in the OT and may represent a contemporary understanding of Judaism in at least a neutral if not positive manner<sup>(14)</sup>.

<sup>(12)</sup> The importance of the connection between Rom 3,27 and Rom 2,17 has recently been emphasized by J. D. G. Dunn, E. P. Sanders, and H. Räisänen. See J. D. G. DUNN, "The New Perspective on Paul", *BJRL* 65 (1982-83) 95-122, 118; see also IDEM, "Mark 2.1-3.6: A Bridge Between Jesus and Paul on the Question of the Law", *NTS* 30 (1984) 395-415, 396; E. P. SANDERS, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia 1983) 33; IDEM, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London 1977) 550; RÄISÄNEN, *Paul and the Law*, 170; and IDEM, "Legalism and Salvation by the Law: Paul's Portrayal of the Jewish Religion as a Historical and Theological Problem", *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie* (ed. S. PEDERSEN) (Theologische Studien 7; Göttingen 1980) 63-83, 70.

For other recent exegetes who link 3,27 and 2,17-24 see, e.g., K. HAAKER, "Das Evangelium Gottes und die Erwählung Israels. Zum Beitrag des Römerbriefes zur Erneuerung des Verhältnisses zwischen Christen und Juden", *ThBeitr* 13 (1982) 59-72, 66: "Für ein Ueberlegenheitsgefühl, wie es der jüdische Lehrer von 2,17-24 gegenüber den *gojim* an den Tag legte, ist kein Platz mehr (3,27)"; M. THEOBALD, "Das Gottesbild des Paulus nach Röm 3,21-31", *SNTU* 6-7 (1981-82) 131-168, 163; E. GRÄSSER, "'Ein Einziger ist Gott' (Röm 3,30)", *Ich will euer Gott werden. Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott* (ed. N. LOHFINK) (SBS 100; Stuttgart 1981) 202; WILCKENS, *Römer*, I, 246; and MICHEL, *Römer*, 155. RHYNE, *Faith Establishes the Law*, 67, acknowledges the connection between 3,27 and 2,17 but understands boasting as confidence in works which have "falsely become a means of salvation" (70). I think this is an incorrect reading of 2,17 especially, and 3,27 as well.

<sup>(13)</sup> MURRAY, *Romans*, I, 82. Murray does prepare for his negative evaluation of boasting in 3,27, however, by adding (regarding 2,17): "That the apostle should have referred to this in connection with what is by implication an indictment demonstrates perhaps more than any other prerogative enumerated how close lies the grossest vice to the highest privilege and how the best can be proscribed to the service of the worst". BARRETT, *Romans*, 54, sees even the Jew's boasting in 2,17 as impossible while granting the possibility of an appropriate boasting when he adds, "though there is of course a sense in which this is proper".

<sup>(14)</sup> KÄSEMANN, *Romans*, 70, comments on boasting in 2,17 and 23: "Whether it is right or wrong depends solely on its object, which is defined by the alter-

A second consideration (besides the term boasting itself) possibly confirms the link between the concluding question at 3,27 and the discussion initiated at 2,17. The clue to this connection lies in the second question of 3,27: διὰ ποίου νόμου. In 2,17 Paul links three concepts: calling oneself a Jew, relying on the law (ἐπιναπαύη νόμῳ), and boasting before God. These three elements of v. 17—Jewish identity, the law, God—are sometimes connected in the self-awareness of the Jew as it is expressed in contemporary Jewish literature. One might say that to consider oneself a Jew is to rely on the law and boast in one's relationship with God. None of this is necessarily bad; it might be considered a neutral description of Jewish self-consciousness<sup>(15)</sup>. Moreover, the wording of Paul's second question in 3,27 is perhaps influenced by the triad of 2,17. In 2,17 boasting is linked with the law in that the boast derives from (supposed obedience to the) law: in 3,27, Paul may wish to say that the *exclusion* of the boast also derives from "law". In order to illustrate this point, one might paraphrase 3,27:

What then becomes of your boasting which depends on your reliance on the law<sup>(16)</sup>? It has been excluded. By what kind of law? Of works? No, by a law of faith.

The play on the word νόμος in 3,27b may have been influenced by the dependence of boasting on the law already present in 2,17. This link between boasting and law also appears in 3,19-20 (although the term καύχησις is lacking). The purpose of the law in 3,19 is to stop every mouth and to make the whole world accountable to God: surely the Jews are included, and no doubt a reference to their idle boasts while transgressing the law (2,17-24)

---

native of God or the flesh. The problem is that even religiously God and flesh can be confused". Based on this understanding of boasting, 2,17 is in itself a potentially positive reality. See also SCHLIER, *Römerbrief*, 83; MICHEL, *Römer*, 128; WILCKENS, *Römer*, I, 148.

<sup>(15)</sup> See J. M. BASSLER, *Divine Impartiality. Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBLDS 59; Chico 1982) 150, on Rom 2,17-24: "Paul opens with an elaborate description of Jewish self-understanding composed of traditional imagery"; Bassler includes vv. 18-20 in this traditional imagery; see also MICHEL, *Römer*, 128: "Die Reihenfolge: Jude, Gesetz, Gott ist bezeichnend und bedeutet eine Steigerung. Dass diese Begriffe eng miteinander verbunden sind, beweisen die jüdischen Gebete (z.b. ApkBar 48,22ff.). Die Schilderung des Paulus ist also dem geschichtlichen Selbstbewusstsein des Judentums entnommen"; SCHLIER, *Römerbrief*, 83: "Ihr Jude-Sein, Das Gesetz-Haben, Gott-zum-Ruhm-haben und Lobpreisen, das charakterisiert sie nach ihrem eigenen Urteil und nach dem des Apostels. Auch bei solcher Kennzeichnung geht Paulus in den Spuren jüdischer Tradition".

<sup>(16)</sup> I have paraphrased "your boasting" to emphasize the reference to 2,17. In fact FG pc it Ambr read ἡ καύχησίς σου. SCHLIER, *Römer*, 115, n. 24, for example, rightly considers this MSS evidence too weak to represent the original. MICHEL, *Römer*, 155, tentatively states: "Vielleicht ist sogar zu lesen: 'wo bleibt dein Rühmen'?" The interpolation of σου may have been caused by a desire to maintain the context of the discussion with a Jewish partner established in 2,17.



lies behind the "stopping every mouth" of 3,19<sup>(17)</sup>. Even though "boasting" language is lacking at 3,19, the concept — and the connection with obedience to the law in 3,20 — is present. The notion of boasting in the law, then, runs throughout Rom 2 and 3 (2,17-24; 3,19-20.27).

Although a link has been established between Paul's question about boasting in Rom 3,27 and his statement in 2,17 one should not have the impression that the referent for boasting in 3,27 is the simple statement in 2,17. On the contrary, 2,17 is only the beginning of a long argument which issues in the conclusion of 3,27: boasting is excluded. In our examination of the general lines of this argument we will discover what is actually a double attack against the boasting of the Jews. First, Paul advances what may be called the "Jewish" critique of boasting. This first (or Jewish) assault on boasting begins almost as soon as the term is mentioned in 2,17 and finds its conclusion at 3,19-20. This criticism is argued from a purely Jewish frame of reference: the Jews may not boast before God based on their law because they do not in fact keep that law (see 2,23). This is the first possible reason for the exclusion of boasting announced in 3,27 ([νόμος] τῶν ἔργων). Paul's second (or Christian) critique of boasting occurs in 3,21-26 and this second critique is also summarized in 3,27 (νόμος πίστεως). We shall briefly summarize Paul's first argument against boasting (2,17-3,20) and attempt to demonstrate its recapitulation in 3,27. After that, we shall take up Paul's second critique of boasting in 3,21-26, and again show that it is summarized in 3,27.

### C. *The First Exclusion of Boasting: Rom 2,17-3,20*

In Rom 2,17 Paul speaks to the contemporary Jew in terms which might have been perfectly acceptable to him: you call yourself a Jew, rely on the law, and boast in your relationship with God. While this description is not in itself negative, one must also acknowledge that Paul immediately begins to criticize boasting. V. 17 itself is a conditional sentence (εἰ) and the reader thus expects at least some kind of qualification to follow<sup>(18)</sup>. The content of this "qualification" appears at vv. 21-24: the Jewish boasting in the law is invalid because, in fact, the Jews do not keep the law in a manner which might justify their boast: "You who boast in the law, do you dishonor God by breaking the law?" (2,23). God is not dishonored by boasting but by transgressions. The boasting, in and of itself, receives no criticism. In this first critique the Jews are attacked for boasts only in the context of transgressions<sup>(19)</sup>.

<sup>(17)</sup> Both WILCKENS, *Römer*, I, 173 and PESCH, *Römerbrief*, 38 link 3,19 and 2,17-24.

<sup>(18)</sup> On whether the εἰ indicates a true anacolouthon or finds its apodosis in v. 23, see e.g. BASSLER, *Impartiality*, 262, n. 99.

<sup>(19)</sup> See E.P. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 550: Paul "does warn the Jews against boasting (Rom. 2.17), but the warning is not against a self-right-

This criticism of the basis of the Jewish boast reappears in Rom 3, with a substantial scriptural basis provided (3,9-18) culminating in 3,19: the whole world lies under the power of sin and every mouth is stopped<sup>(20)</sup>. There can be no boasting in works because the works are not present. The question of Rom 3,27 could have been posed here, immediately after 3,19: if the Jews do not obey the law (2,17-24) and if the whole world lies under sin so that every mouth is stopped (3,9-19), *What, then, becomes of boasting?* The discussion of boasting to this point has shown that boasting in works is eliminated because there are not enough works to maintain the boast. If we read 3,27 immediately after 3,20, the argument would run like this:

1,18-3,20: All, both Gentiles and Jews, are sinners; this can be demonstrated from observation and is also attested in Scripture.

3,27a: What then becomes of boasting? It is excluded.

By a law of works?

Yes! Even the law of works itself attests to the elimination of boasting since there aren't enough good works to maintain the boast.

We are momentarily eliminating 3,21-26 from the discussion but we arrive at a completely coherent reading of 3,27—up to a point. Just when one might expect a positive answer to the question: Is boasting eliminated by a law of works (the positive answer being based on 2,17-3,20), Paul emphatically turns the reader's expectation around and emphasizes: No! Rather, boasting is eliminated by a law of faith. Some of the force of this enigmatic statement, then, can be derived not only from its dialectical character (law versus faith), but from the fact the Paul has seemingly taken great pains to show that, yes, indeed, the law of works itself eliminates boasting. When he poses this question in 3,27 (Is boasting eliminated by a law of

---

teousness which is based on the view that works earn merit before God. The warning is against boasting of the relationship to God which is *evidenced* by *possession* of the law and against being smug about the *knowledge* of God's will while in fact transgressing".

RÄISÄNEN, *Paul and the Law*, 170, n. 52, adds the interesting comment that Justin also "connects the charge that the Jews are 'puffed up with pride' with their boasting of their *race*, their reliance on being descendants of Abraham, and their *transgression* of the law" (Dialogue with Trypho, 102.6).

Recently, R. H. GUNDRY, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul", *Bib* 66 (1985) 1-38, directs a full-scale attack against Sanders, during which he comments on Sanders' notion of "boasting". For Gundry Paul's problems with Judaism lie in "the self-righteousness to which unbelievers who try to keep the law succumb" (13). But surely 2,23 must be decisive: God is dishonored because of *transgression*, not because of self-righteousness based on attempted obedience.

<sup>(20)</sup> As is well known, 3,19 in fact summarizes the argument which begins already at 1,18. In this first stage of his reasoning Paul demonstrates the sinfulness of the Gentiles (1,18-32), after which he turns his attention to the Jews (usually understood as commencing at 2,1, although MICHEL, *Römer*, 127, and others see the Jews first addressed at 2,17). The whole pericope 1,18-3,20 illustrates the universality of sinfulness, encompassing both Gentiles and Jews.

works?) and answers it negatively, this must have come as something of a shock to an astute reader. This dramatic about-face in 3,27 has been made possible by the new argumentation of 3,21-26, the unit which forms Paul's second critique of the boasting of the Jews<sup>(21)</sup>.

*D. The Second Exclusion of Boasting; Rom 3,21-26*

Paul announces the end of boasting in 3,27 no longer because there are insufficient good works to warrant it (2,17-3,20) but because of God's revelation in Christ (3,21-26). Without mentioning boasting in one's relationship with God explicitly in vv. 21-26, Paul gives some indications that his main theme — the Jewish attitude of exclusiveness — has not been forgotten. That this is indeed uppermost in Paul's mind is perhaps indicated by what Paul does *not* say in 3,27 (in which he draws conclusions from 3,21-26). After exposing universal sinfulness in 1,18-3,20 and then proclaiming God's revelation in Christ, Paul does not raise the question, "How then is one made righteous?" Nor does he ask, "Is justification then by works or by faith?" On the contrary, he returns to the point he (apparently) is attempting to stress: What then becomes of your boasting in your special relationship with God? Paul's concern with boasting is evident from 2,17 up to 3,20. But how does the boasting motif permeate 3,21-26 as well?

As we have seen, Paul has emphasized the absurdity of a Jewish boast: since the *basis* of Jewish boasting (works) is completely inadequate, the boast in a status superior to the Gentiles is absurd (2,17-3,20). In 3,21-26 Paul moves to his second level of argumentation. Not only is the Jewish boast internally inconsistent with Jewish practice (i.e. from a Jewish point of view), it is rendered invalid by external concerns as well (i.e. from a Christian point of view): righteousness, which is now available to *all* who believe, without distinction (v. 22), has been revealed not only apart from works, but apart from the very law on which the works are based (v. 21). Rather than through law, persons are justified freely: δωρεάν (v. 24). Finally, this justification came "through faith" (v. 22): the one made righteous is the one who

<sup>(21)</sup> Against our reading of 3,27 as recapitulating Paul's earlier argument that the law of works does in fact exclude boasting, see G. KLEIN "Sündenverständnis und Theologia Crucis bei Paulus", *Theologia crucis - Signum crucis* [Fs. E. DINKLER] (ed. C. ANDERSEN and G. KLEIN) (Tübingen 1979) 249-282, especially 274-277 on Rom 3,27. Klein writes: "Wüsste Paulus das Rühmen nur deshalb ausgeschlossen, 'da es... die Werke gegen sich hat', ergäbe sich zunächst die absonderliche Konsequenz, dass es andernfalls *nicht* ausgeschlossen wäre. Zudem müsste in solchem Fall das Rühmen ja gerade durch das 'Gesetz der Werke' ausgeschlossen sein. V. 27b sagt aber das Gegenteil" (275). I agree that v. 27b says the opposite, but maintain at the same time that v. 27b can reject the belief that the law of works excludes boasting only because of the intervention of God in Christ recounted in 3,21-26. Without 3,21-26, the law of works eliminates boasting, as 2,17-3,20 has indicated. See also D. ZELLER, "Der Zusammenhang von Gesetz und Sünde im Römerbrief. Kritischer Nachvollzug der Auslegung von Ulrich Wilckens", *TZ* 38 (1982) 193-212, 204, who agrees with Klein on this point.

has faith in Jesus (v. 26). The gracious revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ through faith has eliminated any possibility of the Jews boasting in their exclusive relationship with God (regardless of whether they have "works" to boast about or not).

This, then, is Paul's dual attack on the boasting of the Jews: first, their boast is unfounded on its own grounds since they do not keep the law well enough to justify the boast (2,17-3,20); and second, the whole question of status before God is moved to a different arena by the free revelation of God in Christ: one's relationship with God is no longer based on law, but rather on faith, which is available to all (3,21-26). Paul prepares his conclusion in 3,27 with a question which indicates his primary concern throughout this section of Romans: What then becomes of your boast in your alleged special relationship with God? In a final section we can delineate the line of thought in this verse more clearly.

#### E. *The Shift in Rom 3,27: οὐκί, ἀλλά*

In order to follow Paul's reasoning in 3,27, we must once again take special notice of the introductory οὐκί. After presenting the revelation in Jesus Christ (3,21-26), Paul asks: Where then (οὐκί) is boasting? We might paraphrase the rest of v. 27 thus: Is boasting *still* excluded by a law of works? Certainly not (οὐκί): *Now* it is excluded by a law of faith. This new revelation need not necessarily invalidate the previous exclusion of boasting by the law of works, but at 3,27 Paul wishes to emphasize the "Christian" exclusion of boasting<sup>(22)</sup>.

It may seem that Paul has argued for the exclusion of boasting based on the law of works in 2,17-3,20 only to reject it finally in 3,27. In 3,27, then, Paul seems to shift his focus: from the relation between boasting and works to the relation between boasting and Christ. This shift, from an idea that is in fact quite reasonable (in view of 2,17-3,20) to a new understanding of the exclusion of boasting (based on 3,21-26) is highlighted by Paul's specific vocabulary in the verse, through the οὐκί, ἀλλά construction. We can first understand some of the significance of this word pair by contrasting it with the more common (in Paul) οὐ . . . ἀλλά configuration.

Paul often uses οὐ . . . ἀλλά to reject one concept in order to advance another: not the hearers of the law but rather the doers will be justified (Rom 2,13); the reward is reckoned not as a favor but rather as a debt (Rom 4,4); Abraham's faith was reckoned as righteousness not in circumcision but rather in uncircumcision (4,10; see also, e.g. 4,13,20). This straightforward "not this but rather that" construction is common in Paul. But this is not precisely the construction in Rom 3,27. Here we have a more emphatic οὐκί

<sup>(22)</sup> While the designations "Jewish" critique and "Christian" critique of boasting adequately reflect Paul's historical situation, I do not wish to give the impression that the Jewish critique is negative because it is Jewish. In fact, the focus on human activity present in Rom 2,17-3,20 might suggest that the critique be termed simply "anthropological".

rejecting one answer followed immediately by ἀλλά introducing another<sup>(23)</sup>. When the other similar occurrences of this word pair in the NT are investigated we see that they contain a clue to the kind of shift in Paul's thinking in Rom 3,27.

The οὐχί, ἀλλά word pair occurs eight times in the NT, but only twice in Paul: 3,27 and 1 Cor 10,29. The use in 1 Cor is not like that in Rom 3,27 since in the 1 Cor passage each word governs its own object: "not your conscience but his". 1 Cor 10,29 then is not really parallel to Rom 3,27. But οὐχί, ἀλλά... also occurs five times in Luke and once in John, and these forms are like that used in Rom 3,27. In each of these parallel cases the expression is used either to reverse a reasonable expectation or to deny an idea which, however logical or necessary it may appear to be, is wrong. Let us look briefly at each of these cases.

In Luke 1,60 those present at the circumcision of John the Baptist naturally assume that the child will be called Zachary. His mother, however, intervenes: "Not so; but he shall be called John". The normal expectation that the child would be named after his father is overturned with the emphatic οὐχί, ἀλλά pattern. At Luke 12,51, Jesus asks, "Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division"<sup>(24)</sup>. Surely the implication is that peace is precisely what would normally be expected, and in fact had been expected. Twice in Luke's gospel the common assumption that evil befalls notorious sinners is challenged; first, with regard to the slaughtered Galileans in 13,3 and second, concerning those on whom the tower of Siloam fell in 13,5. The "common sense" view would understand these tragedies as punishments for sin. This "received wisdom" of the community is twice rejected: "Do you think they were worse offenders...? οὐχί, I say to you, ἀλλά unless you repent you will all likewise perish" (13,4-5; see also vv. 2-3). In Luke 16 Father Abraham suggests to the rich man that Moses and the other prophets are surely sufficient to bring the man's family to repentance. But the rich man insists: "οὐχί, Father Abraham, ἀλλά if someone goes to them from the dead, they will repent" (16,30). Of course Moses' intervention would be powerful, but the appearance of one back from the dead would be even more impressive. Finally, in John 9,9 people are surprised to find that the formerly blind beggar has now acquired his sight. "Is not this the man who used to sit and beg?", they ask. Some answer: "οὐχί, ἀλλά he is like him". In other words, the mistake is a natural one; in fact, it's not him, but it does look like him.

In each of these instances of the οὐχί, ἀλλά combination, we find a reasonable answer to a question rejected by a new, unexpected or less evident answer. οὐχί, ἀλλά is thus used to reverse an expectation that is reasonable or understandable, but is nonetheless incorrect.

<sup>(23)</sup> οὐχί is a strengthened form of οὐ; with ἀλλά following, it means "nein...vielmehr" (so e.g. P.-G. MÜLLER, "οὐχί", *EWNT* II, 1344).

<sup>(24)</sup> We are ignoring the presence of λέγω ὑμῖν between the οὐχί and ἀλλά here as insignificant for our discussion; the οὐχί/ἀλλά unit functions as if it were uninterrupted (unlike 1 Cor 10,29); see also similar cases with Luke 13,3.5; 16,30 (with a vocative).

In Rom 3,27 we see the same process at work<sup>(25)</sup>. Is boasting eliminated by a (law of) works? By contradicting this notion with the οὐχί, ἀλλά construction Paul acknowledges that some may actually believe that this is the case. But why would they believe this? They could have arrived at this conclusion from Paul's own argument in 2,17-3,20. But at 3,27 Paul is drawing consequences especially from 3,21-26 (οὖν), and now the question of boasting is no longer tied to works, but is rather tied to faith. To make a connection between boasting and works is of course reasonable; to make a further connection between the elimination of boasting and a lack of works is also reasonable, and has even been argued by Paul himself. But in fact the whole question of boasting is now<sup>(26)</sup> moved to another level, and the connection between boasting and works is no longer necessary.

This double attack against boasting is indicated not only by the οὐχί, ἀλλά construction, but also by the shift in the meaning of νόμος in the verse. We can highlight this shift in a final discussion.

#### *F. The Use of νόμος in Rom 3,27*

According to our interpretation of Rom 3,27, Paul shifts his line of reasoning within the verse itself: from the exclusion of boasting through a lack of works (2,17-3,20) to the exclusion of boasting through faith (3,21-26). This shift in Paul's line of reasoning is neatly captured by the specific shift in the meaning of νόμος within the verse.

When Paul asks "Through what kind of νόμος? (That) of works?" he is referring to his argument of 2,17-3,20. But with his use of the word νόμος here is he specifically referring to the Mosaic law which demanded those works? While the "τῶν ἔργων" surely refers to the entire system of the Mosaic law and its accompanying works, we are somewhat reluctant to limit the first νόμος in 3,27 to the Mosaic law. Rather, we suggest that Paul chose the expression "διὰ ποίου νόμου" for at least two reasons. First, he wanted an expression which could capture his first critique of Jewish boasting. Since this first critique focused on a lack of obedience to the Mosaic νόμος the term is associated with that critique. Already at 2,17 boasting in God and relying on the law are parallel with one another. But secondly, Paul also needed to point his readers in the proper direction, *away* from his first critique of Jewish boasting. Paul begins to steer his new course by immediately qualifying the meaning of νόμος in 3,27 even before he writes it. He asks: "Through *what kind* of νόμος?". ποῖος here suggests that νόμος may not be seen only in the sense of the Mosaic νόμος. The fact that νόμος

<sup>(25)</sup> The statement about the exclusion of boasting through a law of works in 3,27 may not be understood "absolutely". It must be seen in the context of 3,21-26 and 3,27a. The οὐχί of 3,27 is in a sense dependent upon the οὖν at the beginning of the verse. Only because of that (which refers back to 3,21-26) can Paul so emphatically reject his previous notion that the law of works eliminates boasting.

<sup>(26)</sup> See also νυνί (3,21) and ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ (3,26).

may also be used in a more general sense meaning "system" or "order" serves Paul's purpose very well. That he also has this more general sense of νόμος in mind is indicated by the interrogatory ποῖος. For even while he is thinking of his first critique of boasting (which is centered on law) he is mindful of his more important second critique (which is centered on faith). The latitude in the word νόμος itself allows it to act as a hinge between these two critiques.

This second critique (3,21-26) is summarized in 3,27 by the expression νόμος πίστεως. Here νόμος is used in its general sense: the system or order of faith. To take νόμος here as the Mosaic law is excluded by the χωρίς νόμου of 3,21a (the scriptural reference of 3,21b does not invalidate this). Furthermore, 3,22 emphasizes the non-legal aspects of this righteousness with its double emphasis on faith. Paul's use of νόμος with πίστεως at 3,27 is simply a continuation of the word-play already begun with the first occurrence of νόμος within the verse. νόμος has moved then from its first use in 3,27 as a general term which includes the more specific meaning of the Mosaic law to its second use simply as a general term.

### *Conclusion*

Our original claim that 3,27 forms a recapitulation of much of Paul's previous argument in 2,17-3,26 results in the following paraphrase of 3,27: Now, in light of the new revelation in Christ (3,21-26) where is the boasting we first mentioned at 2,17? It is eliminated. Through a law of works (as in fact we had argued in 2,17-3,20)? No, now, because of the new revelation (in 3,21-26), boasting is eliminated by a law of faith. Paul has emphatically rejected a reasonable (but now irrelevant) answer to the question about boasting in favor of a gracious (and fundamental) answer. He has pointed to his original double critique of boasting and at the same time has shown the overarching finality of God's intervention in Christ.

St. Francis Seminary  
3257 S. Lake Dr.  
Milwaukee, WI 53207  
U.S.A.

Richard W. THOMPSON

---

## Babylon, der andere Ort: Anmerkungen zu 1 Petr 5,13 und Apg 12,17<sup>(1)</sup>

---

Zu den Kontroversen um Petrus und die petrinische Literatur gehören die eng miteinander verknüpften Fragen, ob Petrus sich nach der Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis des Herodes Agrippa, gewissermaßen versteckt hinter der Anspielung auf den "anderen Ort", *eis heteron topon* (Apg 12,17) nach Rom begab, wie zumindest Euseb und Papias voraussetzen<sup>(2)</sup>, und ob und wann später von dort der 1. Petrusbrief ausging, mit der in dem Kryptogramm "Babylon" verschlüsselten Absenderangabe (1 Petr 5,13). Auf den folgenden Seiten soll knapp skizziert werden, wie sich sowohl innerhalb der Bibel als auch unter Heranziehung der römischen Profanliteratur Lösungshinweise ergeben.

Es gilt heute weitgehend als ausgemacht, daß der "andere Ort" in Apg 12,17 nicht Rom ist, sondern irgendein Versteck außerhalb des Machtbereichs des Herodes Agrippa<sup>(3)</sup>. Für die Ablehnung der Gleichsetzung von Babylon mit Rom in 1 Petr 5,13 durch den historischen Petrus wirkte nachhaltig der u.a. von C. H. Hunzinger erbrachte Nachweis, daß in der jüdischen Literatur dieser Gebrauch nicht vor dem Jahre 70, d.h. nicht zu Lebzeiten des Petrus, anzutreffen sei und die offensichtliche Gleichsetzung von Babylon mit Rom in der Offenbarung des Johannes (14,8 sowie Kap. 16–18) ebenfalls nach-petrinisch sei, es aber unglaublich sein müsse, daß sich der historische Petrus ohne einen bekannten jüdisch-christlichen "Präzedenzfall", d.h. ohne eine Möglichkeit der "Entschlüsselung" durch die Leser, dieses Kryptogramms bedient haben sollte. Und dies hieße denn auch, daß der 1. Petrusbrief kaum vor Ende des 1. Jahrhunderts geschrieben sein könne<sup>(4)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Dieser Aufsatz ist hervorgegangen aus Studien zu meinem Buch *Simon Peter — From Galilee to Rome* (Exeter 1986). Für kritisch-hilfreiche Kommentare danke ich Rainer Riesner, Tübingen, und Howard Marshall, Aberdeen.

<sup>(2)</sup> Vor allem die Chronik Eusebs, bei A. SCHOENE (Hrsg.), *Eusebi Chroniconum Libri Dvo* (Berlin 1866) II, 152–157. Vgl. EUSEB, *K.G.* 2,14,6 + 15,2; HIERONYMUS, *De viris illustribus* 8; S. DOCKX, *Chronologies néotestamentaires et Vie de l'Église primitive* (Leuven 1984) 167–168.

<sup>(3)</sup> So zuletzt wieder I. H. MARSHALL, *Acts* (Leicester 1980) 211.

<sup>(4)</sup> C. H. HUNZINGER, "Babylon als Deckname für Rom und die Datierung des 1. Petrusbriefs", *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land*, (FS. H. W. Hertzberg; [Hrsg. H. Graf Reventlow] Göttingen 1965) 67–77. Hunzinger will auch ausschließen, daß 1 Petr. überhaupt in Rom entstand (*ibid.*, 77). Er bietet dafür jedoch keine Argumente, die die Bezeugung dieses Orts bei Papias (EUSEB, *K.G.* 2,15,2) und die Beweisführung, wie sie zuletzt wieder von J. A. T. ROBINSON, *Redating the New Testament* (London 1976) 150–161, und F. NEUGEBAUER, "Zur Deutung und Bedeutung des 1. Petrusbriefes", *NTS* 26 (1980) 61–86, zusammengestellt wurde, zu



I

Um einer Lösung näherzukommen, müssen wir mit 1 Petr 5,13 beginnen und daraufhin Apg 12,17 überprüfen. Dabei gilt es, von vornherein methodisch festzuhalten, daß fehlende jüdische Belege für die Gleichsetzung von Babylon mit Rom über den möglichen Gebrauch dieser Gleichsetzung durch den historischen Petrus nichts aussagen: es ist nicht zulässig zu behaupten, daß der erste christliche Beleg für einen bestimmten Sprachgebrauch nicht früher liegen könne als der erste entsprechende Gebrauch in der jüdischen Literatur. Ohnehin lagen für jeden christlichen Autor die allgemein bekannten Anhaltspunkte im Alten Testament von Anfang an nahe genug, um einen Vergleich der Hauptstadt des römischen Imperiums mit der des babylonischen Reichs anzubieten. Jeder Jude und jeder wie Petrus aus dem Judentum kommende Christ, der sich in der römischen Diaspora aufhielt — und das waren zeitweise über 50.000<sup>(5)</sup>, wird im Bewußtsein von Mich 4,10 gelebt haben<sup>(6)</sup> und die allgegenwärtigen Zeichen sittlich-moralischen Verfalls und machtpolitischer Unterdrückung an Jes 13-14 + 43,14-21 oder Jer 51-52 gemessen haben. Der Vergleich dieser beiden Erfahrungen, die eine historisch, die andere gegenwärtig, lag zu Zeiten von Caligula (37-41 n.Chr.), Claudius (41-54) und Nero (54-68) auf der Hand.

II

Doch auch für den Nicht-Juden in Rom und dem römischen Imperium hatte Babylon symbolische und metaphorische Bedeutung erlangt, und zwar offensichtlich so sehr, daß auch die einfachen Bürger, der "Mann auf der Straße", davon Gebrauch machten.

In der populären Komödie *Adelphoe* des Terenz, im Jahre 160 v.Chr. aufgeführt und eng an ein heute verlorenes Stück Menanders angelehnt (dessen literarische Spuren noch in neutestamentlicher Zeit gegenwärtig waren: vgl. das Zitat aus der *Thais* bei Paulus, 1 Kor 15,33), wird der Athener Micio in Anspielung auf seinen verschwenderischen Lebenswandel als "Babylonier" bezeichnet:

"... iube nunciam  
dinumeret ille Babylo viginti minas" (*Adelphoe* 914-15),  
zu deutsch etwa: "Laß den Babylonier ruhig die zwanzig Minen zahlen".

---

widerlegen in der Lage wären. Gegen Hunzingers Schlußfolgerungen nachdrücklich auch L. GOPPELT, *Der erste Petrusbrief* (Göttingen 1978) 352.

<sup>(5)</sup> Vgl. J. JUSTER, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1914) I, 209-210: s.a. J. LEIPOLDT-W. GRUNDMANN (Hrsg.), *Umwelt des Urchristentums*, (Berlin 1982) I, 292-298.

<sup>(6)</sup> "Leide doch solche Wehen und stöhne, du Tochter Zion, wie eine in Kindsnöten: denn du mußt zwar zur Stadt hinaus und auf dem Felde wohnen und nach Babylon kommen. Aber von dort wirst du errettet werden, dort wird dich der Herr erlösen von deinen Feinden".

Hier wird babylonischer Luxus auf einen Nicht-Babylonier übertragen; der Athener ist (in Rom, d.h. in einer in Rom geschriebenen und aufgeführten Komödie) zum Babylonier geworden, das Wort hat somit metaphorische Bedeutung entfaltet. Und es ist klar, daß diese Verwendung Babylons schon damals allgemeiner Sprachgebrauch gewesen sein mußte, damit der Witz an dieser Stelle überhaupt verständlich sein konnte<sup>(7)</sup>.

Die Römer hatten natürlich zahlreiche Quellen für ihre Informationen über die sagenhafte Prachtentfaltung Babylons, die Dekadenz und die Exzesse des dortigen Lebens; auch in Rom las man, seit frühester Zeit, und noch bis weit in die christliche Ära hinein, Herodots *Historiēs apódexis*, deren 1. Buch, 180-203, reichliches Material bietet; und unter Claudius (will man der vorherrschenden Datierung folgen — vielleicht auch erst unter Vespasian) schrieb Quintus Curtius Rufus seine *Historia Alexandri Magni*, die in teilweise romanhafter Ausschmückung von den Heldenaten Alexanders des Großen berichtet, nicht zuletzt dabei von dem Babylon, das er vorfand, das er ausbauen wollte und in dem er starb. Für einen Bewohner des römischen Reichs was es also durchaus möglich, das alte Babylon sowohl im 'positiven' Sinn von Größe, Pracht und Macht, als auch im negativen Sinn von Dekadenz und Sittenverfall, mit Rom auf die gleiche Stufe zu stellen. Biblische Vorbilder und profane Quellen sind hier vergleichbar; wer beides heranzieht, sieht, wie naheliegend die Gleichsetzung von Rom und Babylon stets war.

### III

Unmittelbar zur Zeit des Petrus, in den Jahren noch vor der neronischen Verfolgung, finden wir einen weiteren aufschlußreichen Beleg für den symbolischen Gebrauch Babylons: im *Satyricon* des Petron, das spätestens im Jahre 61 entstand<sup>(8)</sup>, jedoch einige Jahre früher spielt. In der *Cena Trimalchionis*, dem fast vollständig erhaltenen Hauptteil des Buchfragments, findet sich ein von Trimalchio vorgetragenes, einem obskuren Publius oder Publilius zugeschriebenes Gedicht, in dem der dekadente Luxus des römischen Lebens mit der babylonischen Metapher gekennzeichnet wird. Die entscheidenden Zeilen lauten:

Luxuriae ructu Martis marcent moenia:  
Tuo palato clausus pavo pascitur  
Plumato amictus aureo Babylonico. (*Satyricon* 55)

Auf deutsch heißt das etwa:

Die Stadt des Mars (= Rom) erschlaft im Wohlstandsrülpfen,  
Für deinen Gaumen wird im Käfig der Pfau gemästet,  
Umhüllt vom babylonischen, goldenen Federkleid.

<sup>(7)</sup> Wie Babylon zum Begriff für die Bezeichnung von Luxusgegenständen wurde, zeigen darüber hinaus PLAUTUS, *Stichus*, 378: "Tum Babylonica et peristroma tonsilia et tappetia advexit, nimium bonae rei", und LUKREZ, *De rerum natura*, 4, 1029: "Cum Babylonica magnifico splendore rigantur".

<sup>(8)</sup> Vgl. G. BAGNANI, *Arbiter of Elegance. A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius* (Toronto 1960).

Das Gedicht fährt dann fort, der Reihe nach weitere dekadente Gaumengenüsse aufzuzählen und mit schonungslosem Spott juwelengeschmückte Ehebrecherinnen und in aller Öffentlichkeit durchsichtig gekleidete Ehefrauen anzugreifen. Auch bei Petron ist natürlich wieder vorausgesetzt, daß Babylon, hier nun direkt im Kontext von moralisch-sittlichem Verfall Roms, allgemein verständlich war. Und sollte das Gedicht tatsächlich authentisch auf Publilius zurückgehen, einen Mimus-Possenschreiber des 1. Jahrhunderts vor Christus<sup>(9)</sup>, dann wäre dieser Gebrauch noch älter.

Zusammenfassend kann gesagt werden: es spricht nichts dagegen, jedoch vieles dafür, daß 1 Petr 5,13 vor dem Hintergrund einer bereits vor Petrus und dann auch zu seiner Zeit gebräuchlichen Verbindung von Babylon und Rom den ersten Beleg einer Gleichsetzung innerhalb des jüdisch-christlichen Sprachgebrauchs bieten konnte<sup>(10)</sup>.

#### IV

Da nun feststeht, daß der historische Petrus das Kryptogramm Babylon für Rom ohne weiteres benutzt haben kann, und zwar durchaus als etwas ganz allgemein Naheliegendes, gibt es nun auch gute Gründe, einer Andeutung J. E. Belsers nachzugehen, der vermutete, daß die schwierige Stelle Apg 12,17 auf Ez 12,3 verweist und damit über Babylon wiederum auf Rom<sup>(11)</sup>.

Wie schon eingangs notiert, steht für Papias und Euseb, und mit ihnen für Hieronymus fest, daß Petrus im zweiten Jahr des Claudius, 42, zum ersten Mal in Rom eintraf<sup>(12)</sup>. Wie lange er in der Stadt blieb<sup>(13)</sup>, ehe er spätestens 48 zum sogenannten Apostelkonzil wieder in Jerusalem eintraf, und wann er dann erneut nach Rom reiste (er dürfte wohl noch Ende 44, als er durch den Tod des Herodes Agrippa seine Bewegungsfreiheit zurückerlangt hatte, die Rückreise nach Jerusalem mit verschiedenen Zwischenstationen angetreten haben und ist wohl kurz nach der Abfassung des Römerbriefs, in

<sup>(9)</sup> H. C. SCHNUR (Hrsg.), *Petron. Satyricon* (Stuttgart 1968) 64, 213, liest Publilius, da Publius keinen Bezug ermögliche, Publilius Syrus hingegen bekannt sei und den Witz der Szene (einen Vergleich zwischen Cicero und ihm) verständlich mache.

<sup>(10)</sup> Für weiteres innerbiblisches Belegmaterial sei verwiesen auf E. G. SELWYN, *The First Epistle of Peter* (London 1947) 303-305 (dort S. 243 auch Material zu den spätjüdischen, rabbinischen Gleichsetzungen von Babylon mit Rom), sowie auf GOPPELT, *Petrusbrief*, 350-354. Zur Widerlegung der gelegentlich noch propapierten Spekulation auf einen Aufenthalt des Petrus in dem kleinen römischen Militärlager Babylon Fossatum am Nil oder gar im mesopotamischen Babylon siehe außerdem J. N. D. KELLY, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude* (London 1969) 217-220. Vgl. auch O. CULLMANN, *Petrus. Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer* (Zürich-Stuttgart 1960) 93-97. Daß Petrus selbst der Verfasser des 1. Petrusbriefes war, ist im übrigen neuerdings wieder durch F. NEUGEBAUER nachgewiesen worden ("Zur Deutung und Bedeutung", 61-86).

<sup>(11)</sup> J. E. BELSER, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg 1901) 197-198; ID., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Wien 1905) 156.

<sup>(12)</sup> S.o., Anm. 2.

<sup>(13)</sup> Dafür, daß Rom schon 41/42 im Gesichtskreis des Petrus gelegen haben

dessen Grußliste sein Name fehlt, wieder in Rom eingetroffen, wo er dann den 1. Brief mit der Formel 1 Petr 5,13 schrieb<sup>(14)</sup>), das kann hier ebenso wenig im Detail erörtert werden wie Entstehungsort und -zeit der Apostelgeschichte, für die immerhin literarhistorisch unbestreitbar ist, daß die Selbstaussagen in Apg 28,14ff. ihren Verfasser als jemanden bezeugen, der wohl einige Zeit in Rom verbrachte. Zumindest dies kann aber gesagt werden, daß dem wohl Ende der fünfziger/Anfang der sechziger Jahre in Rom anwesenden Verfasser der Apostelgeschichte die gleichen Informationen und Kenntnisse zugänglich gewesen sein müssen wie dem Verfasser des 1. Petrusbriefs; selbst eine Begegnung der beiden in Rom kann keineswegs ausgeschlossen werden.

## V

Sei es also, daß Lukas aus eigener Anschauung und eigenem Denken eine Gleichsetzung von Babylon und Rom nachvollziehen konnte, sei es, daß ihm der 1. Petrusbrief bereits vorlag, als er schrieb (und das ist durchaus nicht unwahrscheinlich<sup>(15)</sup>) — die Nutzung von "Babylon" zur Verschlüsselung und zur Entschlüsselbarkeit von Petrus' Anwesenheit in der Hauptstadt des Imperiums nicht lange nach der Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis des Herodes Agrippa liegt ebenso auf der Hand wie die Notwendigkeit einer dem Kundigen dechiffrierbaren Kodierung aus taktisch-politischen Gründen<sup>(16)</sup>. Und so wie Jes 13-14; 43,14-21; Jer 51,1-58; Mich 4,10 u.a.<sup>(17)</sup> allseits vertraute alttestamentliche "Modelle" für die Benutzbarkeit des Babylon-Kryptogramms waren, so erweist sich in der Tat eine andere mit Babylon verbundene Passage, das 12. Kapitel des Buchs Hesekiel, als Schlüssel für das *eis heteron topon*, für den "anderen Ort" in Apg 12,17.

In Ez 12 empfängt der Erzähler das Wort des Herrn (12,1). Ihm wird der

---

kann, bietet der Historiker K. BUCHHEIM, *Der historische Christus*. Geschichtswissenschaftliche Überlegungen zum Neuen Testament (München 1974) 110-146 (hier 126), einige Gründe.

<sup>(14)</sup> Vgl. DOCKX, *Chronologies*, 167-168.

<sup>(15)</sup> Zur Datierung des 1. Petrusbriefs siehe NEUGEBAUER, "Zur Deutung und Bedeutung", 61-68; THIEDE, *Simon Peter*, 173-179. Zum chronologischen Verhältnis von 1 Pet. und Apostelgeschichte siehe ROBINSON, *Redating*, 150-151.

<sup>(16)</sup> Vgl. BUCHHEIM, *Der historische Christus*, 110-146. Lukas zeichnet sich ohnehin durch Vorsicht aus, wenn es um die Berichterstattung von Handlungen geht, die als Widerstand gegen die Staatsgewalt gedeutet werden könnten und seinem Widmungsempfänger, dem hohen römischen Staatsbeamten Theophilus, unangenehm hätten sein müssen. Die Flucht aus dem Gefängnis des Herodes Agrippa wird notiert, die Flucht in die Hauptstadt des Imperiums dagegen wird verschlüsselt. Ebenso verzichtet Lukas in seinem Evangelium (wie der in Rom schreibende Markus und der von ihm hier abhängige Matthäus) darauf, Petrus als den Mann zu identifizieren, der dem Diener des Hohepriesters ein Ohr abschlägt. Immerhin hatte, nach antikem Brauch, Theophilus in dem Augenblick, in dem er die Widmung des Lukas akzeptierte, die Aufgabe übernommen, das Werk auf eigene Kosten zu verbreiten. Hier mußte also Vorsicht walten.

<sup>(17)</sup> Zu weiteren Stellen siehe SELWYN, *Peter*, 303-305, und GOPPELT, *Petrusbrief*, 350-354.

Auftrag gegeben, seine Sachen wie für die Verbannung zu packen und von seinem Ort zu ziehen "an einen anderen Ort", wörtlich, in der ja auch von Lukas benutzten Septuaginta, *eis hēteron tōpon* (12,3). Der Erzähler befolgt den Auftrag, er verläßt die Stadt des Nachts (12,7)<sup>(18)</sup>. Während bis zu dieser Stelle der "andere Ort" zwar lösbar, aber noch nicht namentlich identifiziert ist, folgt die Aufschlüsselung wenige Verse später, als der Herr zum zweiten Mal spricht: auch der Fürst Jerusalems, Zedekia, wird die Stadt (hier Jerusalem) verlassen, des nachts, und er wird — ebenso wie der Erzähler selbst, denn nun wird der "andere Ort" beim Namen genannt — nach Babylon gehen müssen, *eis Babylōna* (12,13).

Ohne daß Lukas den *konkreten*, historischen Rahmen von Ez 12 zu berücksichtigen brauchte, hatte er hier die vollständige Folie für seine Verschlüsselung in Apg 12,17 — die Zielrichtung der "Flucht" ist benannt, es ist Babylon. Und dieser "andere Ort" ist, wie wir bereits wissen, zur Zeit des Petrus und des Paulus-Begleiters Lukas sogar umgangssprachlich mit Rom gleichsetzbar.

Nicht nur für die Juden des Alten Testaments, auch für die aus dem Judentum kommenden Christen war diese Form des Weggehens aus dem eigenen Land, sei es nach Babylon oder nach Babylon-Rom, ein Gang in die Diaspora, in das Exil. Daß gerade zur Zeit des Petrus auch die römischen Juden so empfanden, unterstreicht die Brauchbarkeit der Verschlüsselung in Apg 12,17 ebenso wie die des Kryptogramms in 1 Petr 5,13<sup>(19)</sup>.

## VI

Das Buch Hesekiel war den ersten Christen wohlvertraut. Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*<sup>26</sup>, nennt 195 Stellen des Neuen Testaments, die auf Hesekiel verweisen, darunter sechs direkte Zitate<sup>(20)</sup>. Da wir vom Entstehen sowohl der Apostelgeschichte als auch des 1. Petrusbriefs noch innerhalb der apostolischen Zeit ausgehen müssen, erübrigt sich hier eine Auflistung der Bezugnahmen bei den "Apostolischen Vätern" und in der apokryphen christlichen Literatur, die allerdings die genaue Kenntnis des Hesekiel auch in späterer Zeit nur unterstreichen würde. Ebenso kam es dank Hunzinger keinen Zweifel daran geben, daß auch noch spätere Generationen das Kryptogramm "Babylon" für Rom lebhaft benutzten. Entscheidend ist, daß in den frühen sechziger Jahren sowohl der Verfasser des 1. Petrusbriefs als auch derjenige der Apostelgeschichte damit rechnen konnten, daß die "eingeweihten" Leser

<sup>(18)</sup> Die jüngste Interpretation des Kontexts bei Hesekiel findet sich in B. TIDMAN, *Le Livre d'Ezéchiel* (Vaux-sur-Seine 1985) 176-180.

<sup>(19)</sup> Vgl. JUSTER, *Les Juifs*, I, 209-210, und H. J. LEON, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia 1960).

<sup>(20)</sup> Die Benutzung der Septuaginta-Fassung des Buchs Hesekiel gerade durch Lukas wurde jüngst wieder nachgewiesen von M. R. STROM, "An Old Testament Background to Acts 12:20-23", *NTS* 32 (1986) 289-292. Hier haben wir es zudem mit dem gleichen 12. Kapitel zu tun, dessen 17. Vers ebenfalls auf Hesekiel verweist.

ihrer Zeit die Schlüssel fanden. Für den Petrus des 1. Briefs war seine Grußformel ein geradezu umgangssprachlicher Topos; für den Lukas der Apostelgeschichte war der ungewöhnliche, den aufmerksamen Leser zum Nachdenken und Nachforschen (Stichwort, wenn man so will, 'Exil') veranlassende Gebrauch des "*eis héteron tópon*" die willkommene Möglichkeit zu informieren, ohne zu verraten.

Ebensowenig wie man je vermuten durfte, daß Petrus nicht wußte, wo er war, als er seinen ersten Brief schrieb, hätte man vermuten dürfen, daß Lukas nicht wußte, wohin Petrus ging, als er Jerusalem verließ. Die Autoren des Neuen Testaments mögen uns noch heute Rätsel aufgeben, aber solange wir sie als intelligente Kommunikatoren ernst nehmen und nicht für halbgebildete *idiōtai* halten, haben wir auch die Möglichkeit, bei ihnen selbst die Lösungen der Rätsel zu finden.

Hasselbornring 92  
D-6333 Braunfels

C. P. THIEDE

---

## A Reconsideration of the Text of Daniel in the Apocalypse

---

There has been little study of the text form(s) which influenced John in his Apocalypse. This is an especially striking fact in the light of the general consensus that the Apocalypse contains more OT references than any other NT book. L. P. Trudinger concludes that this lack of study is because there are no quotations prefixed by an introductory formula and most of the OT material is allusive rather than in the form of quotation. Consequently, many have concluded that the textual evidence afforded is too indecisive for the purposes of determining dependence upon particular OT texts. Trudinger correctly objects to this as a legitimate basis for not attempting to determine textual dependence<sup>(1)</sup>. Indeed, although there are no formal quotations (with introductory formulae), there *are* several citations of such length as to be amenable to textual examination. Nevertheless, the discernible OT references in the Apocalypse *are* more informal than those elsewhere in the NT, and although this fact does make textual identifications more difficult<sup>(2)</sup>, it does not make them impossible.

There are two dominant trends of thought about John's textual dependence. Some contend that the Greek OT is the primary source<sup>(3)</sup>, while others view the Hebrew OT as dominant<sup>(4)</sup>. R. H. Charles holds a more cogent mediating view that John drew principally from the Hebrew text but also was influenced by Greek versions<sup>(5)</sup>. Charles also acknowledges influence from Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphical sources<sup>(6)</sup>, although utilization of other Jewish traditions is likewise apparent<sup>(7)</sup>.

(1) L. P. TRUDINGER, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation", *JTS* 17 (1966) 82.

(2) A. VANHOYE, "L'utilisation du livre d'Ézéchiel dans l'Apocalypse", *Bib* 43 (1962) 445.

(3) Cf. H. G. SWETE, *Revelation* (London 1911) CLV; L. CERFAUX-J. CAMBIER, *L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean lue aux Chrétiens* (LD 17; Paris 1955) 7, 203.

(4) Cf. C. C. TORREY, *The Apocalypse of John* (New Haven 1958) 14-48; VANHOYE, "livre d'Ézéchiel", 443-461; L. A. VOS, *The Synoptic Traditions in the Apocalypse* (Kampen 1965) 28-36; TRUDINGER, "Concerning the Text of the OT in Revelation", 84-88; A. LANCELOTTI, "L'Antico Testamento nell'Apocalisse", *RivB* 14 (1966) 369-384; A. GANGEMI, "L'utilizzazione del Deutero-Isaia nell'Apocalisse di Giovanni", *Eunt Doc* 27 (1974) 109-144; B. MARCONCINI, "L'utilizzazione del T.M. nelle citazioni isaiane dell'Apocalisse", *RivB* 24 (1976) 113-136.

(5) R. H. CHARLES, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John I* (Edinburgh 1920) LXVI.

(6) *Ibid.*, LXXXII-LXXXIII; cf. also H. M. PARKER, "The Scripture of the Author of the Revelation of John", *Illiff Review* 37 (1980) 45-51.

(7) For targumim cf. TRUDINGER, "Concerning the Text of the OT in Revela-

Special consideration needs to be given to the use of Daniel in Revelation. Influence from both the MT and Greek OT is apparent<sup>(8)</sup>. With respect to the Greek background there has been virtually unanimous agreement that John was *not* familiar with the older version of the LXX (represented by Codex Chisianus [88] and Chester Beatty X) but only with a Greek version subsequently revised by Theodotion<sup>(9)</sup>.

The purpose of this article, however, is to cite previously unnoticed evidence which supports a conclusion that John did have some acquaintance with the older LXX. There are at least five references in the Apocalypse which read against the MT and Theodotion but are in unique agreement with the old version of the LXX. The clearest such reference is in Rev 17,14 which is likely drawn from Dan 4,37 (LXX):

*Rev 17,14*

ὅτι κύριος κυρίων ἐστὶν  
καὶ βασιλεὺς Βασιλέων.

*Dan 4,37 (LXX)*

ὅτι αὐτός ἐστι Θεὸς  
τῶν Θεῶν καὶ κύριος  
τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεὺς  
τῶν βασιλέων.

This phrase from Daniel is completely lacking in the MT or Theodotion. The probability that this is based on the LXX is pointed to by the observation that the title of 17,14b is followed in v. 15 by almost the same expression of universality which appears repeatedly following the title of Dan 4,37 (LXX; cf. LXX of Dan 4,37a.37b.37c): "peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues" (note also βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ κυριέων τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης followed by almost the same expression of universality in the LXX of Dan 3,2, which are phrases completely missing in the MT and Theodotion). Indeed, that Rev 17,14b is from Dan 4,37 (LXX) is also confirmed by the observation of commentators that Rev 17 makes much use of other references to Daniel, especially Dan 7 and 4<sup>(10)</sup>. Indeed, the title occurs again in Rev 19,16, the only reference Salmon recognizes as a possible link with the LXX, but for some reason does not see much textual significance in it (the

tion", 86-87; M. McNAMARA, *Targum and Testament* (Shannon 1968) 148-156; G. RINALDI, "Il Targum palestinese del Pentateuco", *BeO* 17 (1975) 75-77; P. PRIGENT, "Une tradition messianique relative à Juda", *Le Monde de la Bible* 11 (1979) 46; F. MANNS, "Traces d'une Haggadah pascale chrétienne dans l'Apocalypse de Jean", *Anton* 56 (1981) 265-295; R. P. GORDON, "Loricat Locusts in the Targum to Nahum III 17 and Revelation IX 9", *VT* 33 (1983) 338-339.

<sup>(8)</sup> Cf. CHARLES, *Revelation*, LXVIII-LXXXI.

<sup>(9)</sup> So A. BLUDAU, "Die Apocalypse und Theodotions Danielübersetzung", *TQ* 79 (1897) 1-26; J. GWYNN, "Theodotion" in *Dictionary of Christian Biography* IV (ed. W. SMITH and H. WACE) (London 1887) 975-976; H. B. SWETE, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge 1902) 48; G. SALMON, *An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* (London 1904) 548-550; SWETE, *Revelation*, CLV-CLVI; CHARLES, *Revelation*, LXXX-LXXXI; B. J. ROBERTS, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff 1951) 125; S. JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford 1968) 87.

<sup>(10)</sup> See further G. K. BEALE, "The Origin of the Title 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords' in Revelation 17:14", *NTS* 31 (1985) 618-620.



probable reason is that he failed to observe the title in Rev 17, where it is even closer to the LXX!<sup>(11)</sup> Not coincidentally the contextual meaning of both uses in Revelation is almost identical: Christ (Yahweh) judging a beast-like king(s) who is associated with Babylon.

The second phrase in support of a dependence on the old LXX is in Rev 17,12; 18,10.17.19, where the phrase  $\mu\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\alpha}\ \tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  occurs (cf. accus. in Rev 17,12). This phrase is found in OT versions only in Dan 4,17a (LXX). That John alludes to Dan 4,17a (LXX) is confirmed by the frequent use of other Daniel allusions there, especially in conjunction with Rev 17,5,  $\beta\alpha\text{-}\beta\upsilon\lambda\omega\tilde{\nu}\ \eta\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$ , a phrase occurring uniquely in the OT in Dan 4,27[30] (MT, Theod, LXX). Likewise, the same phrase is found in connection with uses of  $\tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  in Rev 18 (vv. 2.10.21). The contextual meaning is strikingly like that of Daniel, although with a typologically heightened eschatological emphasis, as was the case in Rev 17,14 and 19,16. In Daniel 4 (LXX) the phrase refers to the period when the king of Babylon's sovereignty is removed by God, during which he became like a beast. Likewise in Rev 18,10.17.19  $\mu\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\alpha}\ \tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  refers to the period when eschatological Babylon will be judged by God. The meaning has undergone more development in Revelation 17, but it still refers to beast-like kings associated with "Babylon the Great". Influence from Daniel 4 (LXX) is especially evident in Revelation 18, since part of "Babylon the Great's" judgment in 18,2 includes it becoming a "prison" ( $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$  found 3x) for unclean spirits, beasts ( $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ ) and birds, and the judgment on the Babylonian king in the LXX — not Theodotion or MT — includes him eating "the grass of the earth with the *beasts* ( $\theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ ) of the earth" *together with* being thrown into a "prison" (Dan 4,17a.25;  $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$  found 2x).

It is relevant to mention that the eschatological nuance of  $\tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  occurs in the OT *only* in the LXX of Daniel 8–12, where  $\tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  appears to be *roughly* synonymous with Theodotion's  $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  (Dan 8,17.19; 11,35.40; 12,1). The eschatological *hour* of Daniel 8–12 (LXX) is associated with (1) the period of the end-time enemy's persecution of the saints, (2) his opposition to God, (3) his judgment, (4) covenant disloyalty, (5) God's deliverance of the saints and (6) the resurrection of the dead (the latter two only in Dan 12,1), all of which are eschatological themes also essential to the argument of the Apocalypse. By using  $\tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  the LXX could be emphasizing the quickness with which the events of the eschatological period will occur, especially with respect to judgment (e.g., LXX of Dan 4,17a with 4,33 of Theod), whereas Theodotion may use  $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  to highlight the eschatological *significance* of the period. This background enhances what can be considered a typological-eschatological use of Dan 4,17a (LXX) in Revelation 18. In fact, John may have legitimized his eschatological application of the Dan 4,17a "one hour" on the basis of the repeated and unique eschatological use of  $\tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha$  in Daniel 8–12 (LXX) or he may be reflecting collectively on *all* of these LXX texts<sup>(12)</sup>.

<sup>(11)</sup> SALMON, *Historical Introduction*, 550.

<sup>(12)</sup> The phrase  $\tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha\tilde{\nu}\ \mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\upsilon$  does occur in *both* the LXX and Theod of Dan 4,19, but there it has a completely different meaning than in Dan 4,17a (LXX),

Another significant use of *ώρα* is found in Rev 14,7 (ἤλθεν ἡ ὥρα τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ), which is in agreement with the LXX (Dan 11,45, ἥξει ὥρα τῆς συντελείας αὐτοῦ) against Theodotion (ἥξει ἔως μέρους αὐτοῦ). In 14,14-15 it is the Danielic Son of Man coming on a cloud who executes the judgment of this hour (cf. *ώρα* in v. 15).

This reference in Rev 14,7 may be but the 'tip of an iceberg', since it seems to appear in the midst of a midrash on Daniel 4, which is supported by the following correspondences: (1) Rev 14,6 refers to ἐπὶ πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ φυλὴν καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ λαόν. There is consensus that this phrase throughout Revelation has been coined on the basis of similar formulae in Daniel (cf. Dan [Theod] 3,4.7.96; 4,1; 5,19; 6,26; 7,14; Dan [LXX] 3,2.4.7.96; 4,21.37b; 6,26; cf. also MT)<sup>(13)</sup>. (2) Rev 14,7a, δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν and Dan 4,34 (LXX), δὸς δόξαν τῷ ὑψίστῳ; (3) Rev 14,7b, προσκυνήσατε τῷ ποιήσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν καὶ πηγὰς ὑδάτων has unique correspondence with the LXX of Dan 4,37, αἰνῶ τῷ κτίσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ τοὺς ποταμούς; (4) Rev 14,8, βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, and Dan 4,30 (LXX, Theod, MT), βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη.

It is possible that all five of the above expressions in Rev 14,7-8 have been derived from the LXX version or perhaps that they represent a mixture of texts from the author's learned tradition. At the least, the probability is that the two phrases from Rev 14,7a and 14,7b, especially together with the above *ώρα* reference, derive ultimately from the LXX. Rev 14,7 then serves as another discernible reference to the LXX. (For the next closest OT parallels to Rev 14,7a cf. in order Ps 146,6; 1 Chron 16,29f.; Neh 9,6; Jonah 1,9.)

A fourth indication of LXX dependence occurs in Rev 13,5a, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα, which agrees with Dan 7,6 (LXX), καὶ γλώσσα ἐδόθη αὐτῷ against Dan 7,6 (Theod), καὶ ἐξουσία ἐδόθη αὐτῇ.

Striking also is John's portrayal of the Son of Man as the Ancient of Days (Rev 1,13-14), which has unusual correspondence with the same description in Dan 7,13, where the LXX has the Son of Man approaching God's throne ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν. On the other hand, Theodotion has the Son of Man approaching ἔως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν. Indeed, Rev 1,13-14 should be considered as another example of a LXX reading<sup>(14)</sup>.

i.e., the time during which Daniel was alarmed after hearing and understanding the king's dream. Of course, it is possible that John could have drawn this phrase from Theodotion and used it with total disregard for the context (as he sometimes does), but this is improbable in the light of the discussion and evidence adduced above. Furthermore, it is typical for the author of the Apocalypse to use the OT with varying significant degrees of contextual respect, especially in the case of the more discernible OT references (see further G. K. BEALE, "The Use of the Old Testament in John's Apocalypse", *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (FS. B. Lindars; [ed. D. A. CARSON and H. G. M. WILLIAMSON] Cambridge [forthcoming])).

<sup>(13)</sup> For further discussion see G. K. BEALE, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham 1984) 215-216.

<sup>(14)</sup> So also J. A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh 1927) 304; MONTGOMERY, "Anent Dr. Rendel Harris's

Therefore, contrary to the present consensus, it is evident that John did avail himself of the older version of the Danielic LXX, which was later replaced by Theodotion's version. Indeed, including the repetitions in Revelation of the above five LXX references, eight uses can be counted. Possibly some uses could be accounted for through John's paraphrastic technique based either on the MT or Theodotion, but it would be highly improbable that such paraphrastic developments would be changed coincidentally in a direction corresponding closest to the older LXX. In addition, a majority of the phrases are rather unique expressions (cf. Rev 14,7; 17,12; 18,10.17.19; 17,14; 19,16). Perhaps, as Trudinger suggests for other phrases which John takes from the Greek OT, these from the older LXX may be remembered because "they have a 'by-word' or slogan-like quality"<sup>(15)</sup>. This is especially plausible since the phrases from Dan 4,37 (LXX) and 4,17a (LXX) are repeated in Revelation (cf. the Dan 4,37 [LXX] title also in 1 Tim 6,15 and 1 En 9,4).

In attempting to study John's textual use of the OT, and his reliance on the OT in general, it is perhaps best not to speak of quotations but of allusions or references, or, even better, *dependence*. Three categories of dependence can be designated: (1) *clear dependence* — word order or lexical combinations (a) which are almost in the same form as an OT text, (b) which may also have the same general meaning as the OT context, and (c) which are so uniquely parallel to an OT text that they could not have been taken from any other source or be the mere result of an author's creative composition; (2) *probable dependence* — (a) wording which is not as textually close to that of an OT text but still having definite links with it and/or (b) the presence of an idea uniquely traceable to that text; (3) *possible dependence or echo*—parallel in wording or thought but of a more general nature than in the above categories. The validity of each proposed OT dependence is enhanced if it appears in a context where there is a cluster of other clear references to the *same* OT book or in a context where the thought of a particular section of the same OT book is dominant.

For example, the LXX references from Daniel in Rev 13,5; 14,7; 17,14 and 18,10.17.19 are to be placed in category 1.

These older LXX readings from Daniel are but more evidence of the fluid condition of OT texts in the first century A.D., as, for example, is attested at Qumran<sup>(16)</sup>.

Gordon-Conwell Theol. Seminary  
South Hamilton, MA 01982  
U.S.A.

G. K. BEALE

---

'Testimonies', *The Expositor* 22 (1921) 214-219; C. ROWLAND, "The Vision of the Risen Christ in Rev. 1:13ff.: The Debt of an Early Christology to an Aspect of Jewish Angelology", *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-11. For full discussion of this reading cf. J. LUST, "Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint", *ETL* 54 (1978) 62-69.

<sup>(15)</sup> TRUDINGER, "Concerning the Text of the OT in Revelation", 85.

<sup>(16)</sup> E.g. M. BURROWS, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York 1958) 158-164.

## David as Exemplar of Spirituality: The Redactional Function of Psalm 19

---

Gerald H. Wilson's recent book, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, has opened up new avenues of study in the area of the Psalms, by drawing attention to evidence of purposeful arrangement<sup>(1)</sup>. In this connection he has espoused B. S. Childs' view of the redactional role of David as a model for the individual's response to the conflicts, crises and victories of life<sup>(2)</sup>. In the light of this hermeneutical position Wilson has suggested that the editorial purpose in the positioning of the Davidic groups of Psalms 108-110 and 138-145 was to set up David as a model in reaction to the concerns of the psalms which precede them<sup>(3)</sup>. Thus in Ps 108 David functions paradigmatically as the wise man who gives heed to the cautions of 107,39-42 and relies wholly on Yahweh's steadfast love (107,1.43; 108,4).

Childs' understanding of David's redactional role in the Psalter is tied particularly to the historicizing headings which relate thirteen of the psalms to episodes in the life of David<sup>(4)</sup>. It has not gone unchallenged. His interpretation of David as a representative person "who displays all the strengths and weaknesses of all human beings"<sup>(5)</sup> has been criticized as illogical. Is not his "everyman" approach a contradiction of the concern for ancient history in the superscriptions? Does not the process represent rather a reductive shift, from leaving these psalms open to use by anybody at any time, towards an antiquarian exclusiveness<sup>(6)</sup>? If Childs' interpretation is to win

(1) SBL Dissertation Series 76 (Chico, CA 1985). The concerns of this article relate to chs. 6 and 7 in particular.

(2) "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis", *JSS* (1971) 137-150; also *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia 1979) 520-522. More recently see J. L. MAYS, "The David of the Psalms", *Int* 40 (1986) 143-155, who urges the validity of an "intra-textual" approach.

(3) *Editing*, 221. Cf. G. T. SHEPPARD's study of Pss 1 and 2 in *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct* (BZAW 151; Berlin 1980) 136-144. He has deduced from "a high degree of correspondence in the substance... of these two psalms" that "What Ps. 1 sets forth as a didactic generalisation is matched in historical terms by Ps. 2" (140) and that "By his associations with Ps. 2, David... is identified fully in accord with the ideals in Ps. 1. The entire Psalter, therefore, is made to stand theologically in association with David as a source book of guidance for the way of the righteous" (142).

(4) E. SLOMOVIC has provided an invaluable study of these headings in "Toward an Understanding of the Formation of Historical Titles in the Book of Psalms", *ZAW* 91 (1979) 350-380.

(5) *Introduction*, 521.

(6) See J. BARR, "Childs' *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*", *JSOT* 16 (1980) 19, and R. E. MURPHY, "The Old Testament as Scripture", *JSOT* 16 (1980) 43-44; cf. J. A. SANDERS, "Canonical Context and Canonical Criticism", *HBT* 2 (1980) 191.

general assent, further evidence is required in justification of his claim of a hermeneutical leap from Davidic biography to contemporary relevance.

In support of Childs' thesis reference may be made to the Chronicler's conception of the age of David and Solomon as the beginning of an era of grace which extended to his own time and the source of positive criteria whereby the lives of subsequent generations might be judged. In general the planning and building of the Temple provided a new key for explaining Israel's existence thereafter<sup>(7)</sup>. David's generosity in his material provision for the Temple is presented as a model for Israel which the Chronicler surely intended his own generation to copy (1 Chr 29,18)<sup>(8)</sup>. In this and other respects "the whole of God's relation to man... is concretized in the man David"<sup>(9)</sup>. To Solomon were revealed God's principles of dealing with his people (2 Chr 7,14). These principles became the criteria for assessing future kings (see 2 Chr 36,11-16) and in particular for explaining the eventual rehabilitation of Manasseh (2 Chr 33,12.13), who for the Chronicler was a prototype of exilic and post-exilic Judah<sup>(10)</sup>. The reign of Hezekiah re-established the religious ideals associated with the reigns of David (2 Chr 29,2.25-30) and Solomon (30,26). The Chronicler's version of Hezekiah's reign "invites the reader to recognize the typical, the universal, in the particular account"<sup>(11)</sup>.

This post-exilic presentation of the Davidic monarchy as a model for the people of Judah is suggestive for the Psalter. Do the Psalms too bear witness to a hermeneutical process which saw paradigmatic value in the sacred beginnings of Davidic kingship? In the light of the Chronicler's approach the presumed gap between historical particularity and the existential present is narrowed. It is by no means unreasonable to posit that in the Psalter also the ancient hero *mutatis mutandis* became a standard of spirituality for members of each generation of God's people. If so, the Davidic headings, such as those to Pss 51 and 52, served to encourage readers to view David as a model for individual piety, however hard times were and even when sin had triumphed. Furthermore, not only the historicizing headings but even the simple heading "Psalm of David" would carry a message of a spiritual role model from whom each reader was invited to learn.

In this connection it is worthwhile to examine Ps 19. Academic study has not unnaturally focused upon the internal difficulties it poses. It is generally considered to be a Torah-wisdom composition prefaced with a creation hymn<sup>(12)</sup>. In terms of genre it interrupts a run of royal psalms, Pss 18; 20; 21. This phenomenon is suggestive in the light of Wilson's researches: was

(7) Cf. the title of R. L. BRAUN's article in *Concordia Theological Monthly* 42 (1961) 502-514: "The Message of Chronicles: Rally 'Round the Temple'".

(8) Cf. R. L. BRAUN, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", *JBL* 92 (1973) 516.

(9) R. NORTH, "Theology of the Chronicler", *JBL* 82 (1963) 381.

(10) Cf. H. M. G. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (London 1982) 389.

(11) P. R. ACKROYD, "The Chronicler as Exegete", *JSOT* 2 (1977) 13-14.

(12) Apart from the standard commentaries see especially D. J. A. CLINES, "The Tree of Knowledge and the Law of Yahweh", *VT* 24 (1974) 8-14; C. DOHMEN, "Ps 19 und sein altorientalischer Hintergrund", *Bib* 64 (1983) 501-517.

Ps 19 intentionally inserted into the group by way of hermeneutical comment? On examination there is a remarkable overlap of vocabulary between Ps 18 and the second half of Ps 19 (vv. 8-15). Yahweh is hailed with the language of faith as צור "my rock" twice in Ps 18, in v. 3 and also in v. 47; the epithet recurs in 19,15. His "ordinances" (משפטי יהוה, משפטים) feature in 18,23 and 19,10. Personal, human blamelessness (איתם ואדי תמים) is mentioned in 18,24,26 and 19,14. What is postulated of Yahweh in Ps 18 is in three cases applied to his Torah in Ps 19, in a chiasitic order. Yahweh shows himself pure (תהדר 18,27), and the Torah is pure (טהרה 19,9). Yahweh gives light (תאיר 18,29) and so does his Torah in turn (מאירת 19,9). Yahweh's way is perfect (תמים 18,31) and so is the Torah (תמימה 19,8). Moreover, in the superscription of Ps 18 David is described as עבד יהוה "Yahweh's servant", while in 19,12,14 the psalmist twice calls himself עבדך "thy servant". The accumulation of parallels points to a clear conclusion: the purpose of juxtaposing the two psalms was evidently to relate David's experience to the individual believer who sought guidelines for personal living.

This redactional aligning<sup>(13)</sup> of Ps 18 material with Ps 19 carries further a process already present within the former psalm, where mention of David's own spirituality twice develops into generalized teaching (vv. 21-25/26-28. 29-30/31). In his relation with God David is an exemplar for "all those who take refuge in him" (v. 31). Ps 19 seems to have been placed beside Ps 18 in order that its second half might serve to develop those hints of David as a role model which were already evident in the royal psalm. From a redactional perspective David as the servant of Yahweh no longer has a special role as partner in a royal covenant. The term does not elevate him above Israel, but brings him down to the level of the individual believer committed to serving the same God<sup>(14)</sup>. In the light of the juxtaposition of the two psalms, the description of "presumptuous sins" as an overpowering force (19,14) may have been regarded as a reinterpretation of David's military enemies, in terms of a spiritual warfare. Overall, the redactional message proclaimed by the juxtaposition is that for the devout student of Torah the psalms of David open up vistas of personal applicability.

Fuller Theological Seminary  
135 N. Oakland Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101

Leslie C. ALLEN

<sup>(13)</sup> Ps 19 was evidently not composed for this purpose. The presence of the first half which has no relation to Ps 18 suggests that it was an existing composition, part of which was judged to be suitable for a redactional purpose.

<sup>(14)</sup> This "democratization" is not the only redactional use made of a royal psalm. In the Songs of Ascents the royal and Zion-oriented Ps 132 apparently serves to define the eschatological hope of Israel (cf. Pss 130,7; 131,3).

## The Dual Glow/Grow Motif

---

Numerous are the cases in the Hebrew Bible in which fire and light are connected with the appearance of God and the perception of His providence. Many, also, are the occurrences of growth and land terminology related to theophanies and disclosures of God's will. The present study identifies and illustrates passages in which the biblical artists conflated the two traditions through the literary use of polysemy and wordplay. Frequently, however, the preeminence of either the light tradition or the growth tradition eclipsed the other leaving it all but unrecognizable. The combined motif emerges as playing a major role in passages of God's intervention in the human realm.

Semantics research marked by study of associative fields and comparative linguistics, and literary analysis of parallelism, metaphor, polysemy and pivotal placement of key words aided in the recognition of the dual light-growth themes.

### 1. *Shine forth/Sprout*

The root *šmh* most often means "sprout," "spring up" (BDB). The Syriac cognate, however, denotes either "shine forth" or "spring". Jastrow, too, identifies *šmh* in biblical Hebrew as "to break forth, shine, bloom, sprout, grow". Both, the "illuminating" and the "growing" significations accord well with the light and field polysemy that characterize many texts of divine revelation. These examples are clustered in poetic descriptions of God's providence as sprouting and as shining forth. The imagery surrounding the appearance of the root *šmh* does not limit the meaning to one or the other, but extends the ambiguity and all but insists on an amphibolous reading. Biblical writers often expressed their accounts of divine revelations in forms characterized by wordplay. This may, perhaps be attributed to a desire "to invite a search for meanings that were not readily apparent"<sup>(1)</sup>.

In Isa 58,8, the prophet couched his description of YHWH's revelation in paronomastic forms. Furthermore, by invoking two denotations of each of three words in Isa 58,8a, the prophet effects an artistic blending of the motifs of glowing and growing which play so prominently in depictions of divine manifestations. The noun *'wr* means "light" and "field"<sup>(2)</sup>; the first

<sup>(1)</sup> J. M. SASSON, "Wordplay in the O.T.", *IDBSup* (Nashville 1976) 968.

<sup>(2)</sup> Cf. the expression *'ūr kašdim* as understood by LXX in Gen 11,28, 11,31; 15,7, and Neh 9,7; M. DAHOOD, *Psalms I* (AB 16; Garden City 1966) 223; in

verb, *yibbāqa'*, "will break forth" refers to both the light and the field<sup>(3)</sup>; the second verb *tišmaḥ* denotes "will shine forth" and "will sprout". Thus, the entire passage exhibits the same ambiguity insisting on two simultaneous understandings:

Then your light (*'ôrekā*) will break forth (*yibbāqa'*) as the dawn  
And your healing will shine forth (*tišmaḥ*) quickly...

and the equally felicitous rendering,

Then your field (*'ôrekā*) will break up (*yibbāqa'*) as ["surely as"  
or "quickly as"] the dawn  
And your healing will sprout (*tišmaḥ*) quickly...

The prophet thus links the two motifs of revelation in his collocation of the polysemous words: one meaning of each expressing the land or field theme; the other meaning, the light and radiance theme.

In 2 Sam 23,1-7, David conveys a poetic description of God's favoring of him and his house. V. 4 contains imagery of the sun's brilliance, the morning rain and the earth's vegetation. V. 5 asks rhetorically,

Will He not cause all my salvation  
And [my] every desire to sprout (*yašmāḥ*)?

This coupling of the noun, "salvation" and the verb *šmḥ* gives rise to ambiguity as to the precise sense of the verb. The reader immediately construes the verse with the more common signification of *šmḥ* "to sprout". A consideration, however, of several of the occurrences of imagery of light surrounding the appearance of salvation gives pause.

Ps 27,1 YHWH is my light and salvation (*'ôrî wəyîš'î*).

Isa 49,6 I will make you a light to the nations for my  
salvation (*l'ôr gôyim lihyôt yəšû'âtî*) [to reach] to the ends of the earth.

Isa 62,1 Till righteousness shines like a brilliant light  
and salvation like a blazing fire (*'ad yēšē' kannōgah šidqāh wîšû'ātāh kēlappîd yib'ār*).

In each of these examples, salvation is pictured as shining forth. In light of these texts, an additional nuance is introduced in 2 Sam 23,5. "Salvation" *yəšû'ā* is the object of the ambiguous transitive verb *yašmāḥ*, therefore "He will make salvation shine forth" is just as apt a translation and needs to stand alongside "He will make salvation sprout".

which he discusses 'wr II "land" in Isa 26,19, Ps 36,10, Ps 97,11, Job 33,30 and Ps 56,14 in light of Ps 116,9; and D. GROSSBERG, "Pivotal Polysemy in Jer XXV:10-11a" to appear in *VT* 36 (1986) in which he argues for 'ur II "land" in Jer 25,10, Isa 10,17, Isa 25,15, and in Isa 58,8 under study here.

(3) The verb *bq'* appears in numerous biblical texts relating to the earth and tangible materials (e.g. Num 16,31, 1 Kgs 1,40). In Isa 58,8 it is used of light in a borrowed sense alongside its proper employment relative to field or land.



The "light" motif coupled with a "growth" motif frequently surrounds the appearance of *šdq(h)* "righteousness" also. We thus see examples like Mal 3,20, in which the prophet promises the faithful that "the sun of righteousness *shall shine* with healing in his wings". The psalmist in Ps 37,6 assures the steadfast that the Lord "will make your righteousness *shine like the light* and your justice like the noonday sun". Isa 62,1 also has radiant "righteousness *shine like a brilliant light* and salvation like a blazing torch" (4).

Alongside the examples of resplendent righteousness, we have numerous others of agrarian righteousness, e.g., Jer 31,22-23: "The Lord bless you, Pasture of righteousness, Holy mountain". Similarly, Jer 50,7 employs the same epithet for God, "the Lord, Pasture of righteousness", and joins it to an analogous epithet, "Pool of their fathers" (5).

The close connection between God's bestowing of righteousness and the agrarian element is also apparent in Hos 10,12. The prophet enriches the text by providing a *double-entendre* based on the two senses of *yōreh*, "teaches" and "rains down": "... till he come and *yōreh* righteousness to you". (cfr. too Hos 6,3). The verse begins with three poetic cola including the imperative forms of three farming activities to be done "for righteousness" and "according to lovingkindness" (6). The middle of the verse refers to seeking YHWH, and the final colon relates to the outcome: "He will come and *yōreh* righteousness to you". *yōreh* has both its denotations operative in this verse. Just as the beginning of the verse states "Sow righteousness for yourselves", so the end of the verse affirms, "He will teach righteousness to you" (cf. Isa 28,9, *yōreh dē'ā // yābîn*). Nonetheless, just as the first three finite verbs are agricultural activities that man is to perform for righteousness, so, the final image is of YHWH "raining down righteousness" on them.

The best method of arriving at a description of meaning of a vocable is by noting its association with some words and its opposition to other words. Its frequent collocation in particular idioms with yet other words also exerts a semantic influence (7). This type of study of the associative field of *šdq* and

(4) R. A. ROSENBERG, "The God Šedeq", *HUCA* 36 (1965) 164, claims that these cases of *šdq* shining may be vestiges of an ancient Near East solar cult. Rosenberg argues that the frequent *šedeq* of Jerusalem, usually translated "righteous" or "righteousness" is to be understood as the "personified attribute of justice associated with the sun-god". *Šedeq*, maintains Rosenberg, was the beneficent manifestation of the sun-god to the Canaanites. Once Yahwism predominated in Jerusalem, the deities indigenous to the city were merged in YHWH's person.

(5) For this rendering of Jer 50,7 see D. GROSSBERG, "Multiple Meaning: A Literary Device in the Hebrew Bible", *College Language Association Journal* 26 (1982) 208-209; and note the bucolic imagery of Jer 50,6.

(6) There is perhaps an additional play on light and growth in the third colon. Can *nyrw lkm nyr* be taken as "light a light for yourselves" in accordance with the two meanings of *nyr/nwr* discussed in GROSSBERG, "Pivotal Polysemy"?

(7) J. F. SAWYER, *Semantics in Biblical Research, New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation* (London 1972) 32.

*šmh* reveals a concentration of occurrences of these words in messianic prophecies that are marked by terms of growth and light.

The well-attested association of *šdq* with radiance and growth imagery plays prominently in our reading of Jer 23,8 in which YHWH foretells His raising up a *šemah šaddiq* of David's line. The resonances and reverberations of the term ineluctably figure in the understanding. A deft poet, moreover, incorporates the various charges of a word in his piece adding a richness and multi-layered quality. Jer 23,5 immediately follows four verses dominated by agrarian, pastoral and field imagery. The understanding of *šemah* as "shoot" is, thus, consistent with this imagery and constitutes the growth motif of this divine promise. The recurrent collocation of *šdq* in contexts of "radiance" and "light" elsewhere in Scriptures influences and enriches our understanding. Here, too, the motif of "light" is present. We need but to recognize the dual meaning of *šmh*. The Lord is promising here, as in Jer 33,15, both a "righteous [or 'rightful'] brilliance" and a "righteous [or 'rightful'] shoot" for the Davidic line<sup>(8)</sup>.

The term *šemah* has been translated most often as "shoot" or "branch" and by extension, as "heir". Later it became a technical term for the expected messianic king. The prophet in Zech 3,8 foretells in the name of YHWH, the bringing of "My servant, *šemah*" and in 6,12 he announces, "Behold, a man whose name is *šemah* shall *yīšmah* from the place where he is and he shall build the Temple of YHWH". The terms may certainly be rendered as they most often are, "My servant, Branch" or "Shoot" and "a man whose name is Branch or Shoot shall branch out" (cf. Isa 11,1). This accepted translation notwithstanding, the associative fields suggest also, "My servant, Brightness" and "a man whose name is 'Brightness' will shine". Contextual support comes two verses following the passage "My servant, *šemah* (in the text as we have it today, at any rate). Zech 4,1-3 records the vision of the symbolic lampstand with "two olive trees on it". Just as the word, *šemah* can be construed as illuminating and growing, so the menorah sheds light and recalls the branching olive tree. God's presence symbolized by the lampstand and God's anointed called *šemah* share the identical light/growth ambivalence.

## 2. Joy/Growth/Radiance

A fascinating example of a divine assurance given to the righteous and the upright appears in Ps 97,11

A sown 'wr for the righteous  
And for the upright *šimhā*.

<sup>(8)</sup> J. SWETNAM, "Some Observations on the Background of צִדִּיק in Jeremiah 23,5a", *Bib* 46 (1965) 29-40 argues that the word *šaddiq* be understood as "legitimate" or "rightful" on the basis of the immediate context of Jer 23,5 and extra-biblical occurrences of phrases cognate to *šemah šaddiq*. The most pertinent evidence Swetnam addresses is a 3rd Century Phoenician inscription from Cyprus known as *Larnax Lapēthos* 2 in which *šmh šdq* occurs. The context there demands the translation "rightful scion" or "legitimate offspring".

The first word (in the Hebrew) of Ps 97,11 is 'wr "light" or "field". Here 'wr has the meaning "field" and is in harmony with the second Hebrew word in the verse, *zārūa'* "sown"<sup>(9)</sup>. There is more here, however, than a mere one-to-one correspondence of word and meaning. Indeed, the first colon can be rendered, "A sown field for the righteous". However, with an eye on the parallelism of the verse and with an awareness of the refined figure of poetic ambiguity, one can see more. The last word of the verse, *šimhâ*, generally rendered "joy" can answer the "growth" sense of a "sown field". A word of the same root in Prov 10,28, *šmḥh* can be taken as a verb meaning "it sprang up"<sup>(10)</sup>. As such, it is a cognate of Akk *šamaḥu* "to be luxuriant" and Arab *šamaḥa* "was very high". Thus, *šmḥ* in Ps 10,28 has the sense of the orthographically and phonetically similar *šmḥ*. We therefore propose the following as an appropriate rendering of Ps 97,4:

A sown field for the righteous  
And for the upright a sprouting.

This is but one legitimate understanding of the verse. The more common denotation of 'wr can indeed be maintained alongside the one offered above. Thus,

Light is sown for the righteous  
And for the upright *šimhâ*.

*Šimhâ*, whose primary meaning is "joy", through extension of meaning encompasses an "illumination" sense, also. The two cola are metaphorically congruent however we construe 'wr. If 'wr denotes "light", then *šimhâ* denotes "radiance"; if 'wr denotes "field", *šimhâ* denotes "sprouting". The Ugaritic *šmḥ* in "*buni* [I] *pnm tšmḥ w'l yšhl pīl*]" (II Aqht II 8-9 = KTU 1.17.II 8-9) is understood as "Danel's face lights up, while above his forehead shines"<sup>(11)</sup>. This Ugaritic text is the basis for the translation of Prov 13,9, "the light of the righteous [*yīšmaḥ*] flares up" or "... shines brightly". The Ugaritic *pnm tšmḥ* "his face shines" indicates that the stem denotes "... more than the luxuriant growth of vegetation or the luxuriant splendour of people"<sup>(12)</sup>. Akkadian *šamḥat* bears a close affinity to Hebrew *šmḥ* as in *šamḥat nabnītsu šarīr nišī ʿnišū*, "his figure was brilliant, sparkling the glance of his eyes" (En El I 87). "If... *šamaḥu* shares with its cognates the idea of 'shine', *šamḥat nabnītsu* could be translated 'his figure was brilliant' and the two parts of the verse would complement each other"<sup>(13)</sup>. The NJV renders Prov 13,9 "The light of the righteous is radiant" and Ps 97,11b, "radiance for the upright". The semantic affinity of "radiance", "shining" and

<sup>(9)</sup> M. DAHOOD, *Psalms II* (AB 17; Garden City 1968) 362.

<sup>(10)</sup> G. R. DRIVER, "Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs", *Bib* 32 (1951) 173-197, here 179.

<sup>(11)</sup> H. L. GINSBERG, "The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat", *BA-SOR* 98 (1945) 15, n. 20.

<sup>(12)</sup> DRIVER, "Problems", 180.

<sup>(13)</sup> J. C. GREENFIELD, "Lexicographical Notes II", *HUCA* 30 (1959) 36.

"light" to "joy" needs no comment. The psalmist uses the polysemous words poetically and mystically to promise the righteous and the upright both effulgence, and fecundity for their fields.

A similar account of God's beneficence appears in Isa 9,1-2. This celebrated passage describes the people's exaltation over the appearance of the Davidic ruler.

Isa 9,2 You have magnified the nation  
 You have given it great *śimhâ*  
 They *śāmēhû* before You  
 As the *śimhâ* of the harvest...

The familiar hallmarks of the emergence of salvation are stamped on this ode too. The prophet begins with the dazzling perception by the people of great light amidst their darkness. He then attributes the *śimhâ* of the nation to God and reports that the people *śāmēhû* as they do in the *śimhâ* of the harvest.

Isaiah here resorts to a subtle, artistic wordplay. He employs the same polysemous Hebrew root 3 times in the same verse. The first and third time, the words are similar noun forms; the second time it is a verbal form. The three-fold repetition of *śmḥ* calls attention to the root which is the focus of Isaiah's play. The art rests on the shifting meanings of the same root at each of its appearances. The conventional denotation of *śmḥ* "rejoicing" is demanded in its first appearance. This joy comports well with the obvious gladness of the people at their perceived deliverance. The second appearance of the root calls forth the "shine" meaning of *śmḥ*. This "light up" denotation is manifestly consistent with the brilliance emphasized in 9,1 wherein the people "saw a great light". The third occurrence of the root carries the meaning "growth" or "sprouting" and coheres well with the harvest image which immediately follows. The psalm-like revelling in God's deliverance in these verses and the express imagery of light and harvest demand the multiple understanding of the root *śmḥ*. God's providence is envisioned as simultaneously radiating and fructifying. The exclusionary tendency of many commentators and the frequent one-dimensional translations do not adequately address the multi-dimensional literary feature of poetry. In this verse in particular, such limited understanding does not recognize the prophet's refined use of polysemy which serves to link and blend the two motifs.

### 3. *Light/land alternation in Isaiah*

Deutero-Isaiah, too, envisions the same two elements as he anticipates the emergence of salvation and deliverance. The alternating motifs accoutering the prophetic vision of the divine intervention are striking.

In Isa 60, 61 and 62, the dominant theme of light alternates with figures of planting and growth in rapidly changing succession. Chap. 60 begins with the dazzling radiance of YHWH, conventional symbolism of salvation and divine presence. In v. 13 the glory of Lebanon, the juniper, the box tree and the cypress together are invoked as adorning Jerusalem. From this abores-

cent sign, Chap. 60 returns to the illumination of YHWH as exceeding in brilliance the light of the sun and moon (v. 19) and as never setting but providing an eternal radiance (v. 20). V. 21 again wheels about to forecast that the righteous "shall forever possess *the land*"; they shall be "a shoot of my own planting" says God. Chap. 61 strengthens the pendulum-like swinging between light and growth. In the promise of New Jerusalem, *ma'āteh tēhil-lā*. "Garment of brightness" shall adorn them and they shall be called "oaks of righteousness" and "YHWH's plant" (v. 3). V. 5 predicts that strangers shall serve as shepherds of the flocks and aliens shall be *plowmen* and *vinedressers*. V. 7 foretells that eternal *šimhā* shall be theirs. The chapter closes with a verse that continues and intensifies the land/light oscillation with another three-fold repetition of the polysemous *šmh* and the introduction of the root *yš'*.

For as the earth (*tôšî' šimhā*) brings forth its sprouting/  
makes its radiance shine  
And as a garden makes its seed shoot up (*tašmīah*)  
So the Lord God will make righteousness  
and brightness shine/shoot up (*yašmīah*)  
In the presence of all the nations.

The verb, *tôšî'* from the root *yš'* has two meanings consistent with the prophecy of God's future action. *yš'* I means "emerge"; II means "shine". Isa 62,1, Hos 6,5 and Ps 37,6 attest to the sense, "shine" and relate to Arabic *waḍu'a*, "be clean, fair", and *ḍa'a*, "shine"<sup>(14)</sup>. Isa 51,4-5 can be added to the citations above, forming a significant group with Isa 61,11 in all of which divine judgment, righteousness or salvation is envisioned as shining forth.

Chap. 62 opens with the flashing figure, "Till righteousness shine like a brilliant light and salvation like a blazing torch" (v. 1).

Whether salvation and righteousness are understood as hypostatizations of the deity or as signs of his providence, their emergence share some of the same concomitants as theophanies in the Bible. They are surrounded by abundant light and growth imagery.

#### 4. The Branched Menorah

The language in Exod 25,31-38, employed to describe the sacred lampstand shows that it must have resembled a tree. From a pedestal, which is not described, rose a trunk, and from this spread the branches, curving upward from the stem at three points on a vertical line; on the trunk there are said to have been four, and on each of the branches three calyxes shaped like almond blossoms. This candlestick corresponded, on the whole, to the one described in Zech 4,1-3, except that the latter had seven branches while the Exodus menorah had only six branches. Both call to mind a tree with six or seven branches respectively. Moreover, the lampstand in Exod 25,31-38 was

(<sup>14</sup>) M. H. POPE, *Job* (AB 15; Garden City 1965) 172.

adorned with almond blossoms. That the menorah apparently had a symbolic meaning is supported by Zech 4,1-3. A mystical blend of the natural growing plant with the source of illumination is striking in the menorah and consistent with other manifestations of God's presence.

The biblical combination of arborescent form and illumination in the menorah is to be seen against the background of the ancient Near East. Analogous symbolic representations of the deity appear in the Mesopotamian, eastern Mediterranean, Syro-Palestinian and Aegean iconography. The predominant scene in Assyrian cylinder seals is the winged solar disc, symbol of Assur, occurring "very frequently as an important part of the ritual tree scenes, positioned directly above the tree in a prominent way. Its intimate symbolic connection as supplier of light with the fecundity expressed by the tree is apparent"<sup>(15)</sup>.

### *Conclusion*

Descriptions of God's providence, appearance, judgment and presence naturally assume a highly symbolic style in the Bible. The biblical stylists couch these depictions in equivocal terms playing on more than one recurring theme of this type of text. One function of which is to enhance the aspect of mystery and ambiguity that comports well with the accounts of divine revelation. Furthermore, by making use of two prominent motifs, the literary artists cast their texts in a revelational mold and place them within a theophany tradition. Additional reflexes of this same dual motif may possibly be identified in the burning bush theophany (Exod 3) and in the confusion over Moses' growth of horns or his rays of light (Exod 34). The two motifs which loom large in so many of these descriptions are those of light and growth. We can only conjecture as to the reason for their prominence. The illumination theme in the texts may emanate from the fascination that ancient man had with fire, lightning and the sun. Cultic devotion to each of these are amply attested in the ancient Near East. The growth terminology of the passages may derive from an early animistic stage of religion in which the divine will was revealed in special trees or their proximity. Later, vegetation of fertility cults may have contributed to the growth tradition. Frequently, one of the themes, of growth or light, assumed a prominence and obscured the other. This literary and linguistic study of texts dealing with divine interposition in human affairs reveals a frequent blending of the two motifs through the use of literary polysemy and wordplay.

State University of New York  
1400 Washington Ave.  
Albany, NY 12222 U.S.A.

Daniel GROSSBERG

<sup>(15)</sup> C. L. MYERS, *The Tabernacle Menorah: A Synthetic Study of a Symbol From the Biblical Cult* (ASOR Dissertation; Missoula 1976) 95-122.

### Heisst syr. *ḥašqbōl duplex*?

*ḥašqbōl* ist eine alte crux interpretum. Das zeigt ein Blick in Payne-Smith 1, 1390 oder in die Walton-Polyglotte zu Jes 65,7 (*ex adverso*) oder W. Cureton, Spic. 71,9 (*the contest of feeling*). Das *Lexicon syriacum*<sup>2</sup> und <sup>1</sup> entscheidet sich für die Bedeutung *duplex*.

Einen ersten Zweifel an der Richtigkeit von *duplex* kann der Beleg Spic. 44,4 erwecken aus dem Brief des gefangenen Mārā bar Serapion (Ende 3. Jhdt.) an seinen jungen Sohn. Wir haben etwa zu übersetzen: "Eitles Lob, von dem das Leben voll ist, zählst du nicht zu den Dingen, die uns Freude bringen. Schnell wird uns Verdruss daraus. Auch selbst die Geburt der lieben Kinder [zählst du nicht dazu]; denn mit zeierlei zumal (*ḥašqbōl*) trifft sie uns: die guten quälen uns mit ihrer Liebe, und wir werden mit ihrem Gebahren gezüchtigt; von den schlimmen werden wir durch ihre Widersetzlichkeit müde gemacht und durch ihre Verkehrtheit unter Alldruck gesetzt...". Auf die vorgeschlagene Wiedergabe führt Peschitta zu Jes 65,7. Dort steht *ḥašqbōl* für hb. *yaḥdāw* (fehlt G, doch führt es Lukian als ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό ein, ebenso, unter Asteriscus, Origenes; Vulg.lat. *simul*); es heisst etwa *zugleich* und fasst wie jenes zwei oder mehrere Personen oder Begriffe, sie einander gegenüberstellend, zusammen. Das gilt auch für alle in *Lex syr*<sup>2</sup> angeführten und noch zu besprechenden Belege.

Die Übersetzung von Pš Jes 65,7 sei mit Rücksicht auf ESLamy 2,197,3 mit V. 6 begonnen: "Siehe, geschrieben steht vor mir (*qdāmay*): Ich werde nicht ruhen bis ich zweimal (*a'pā*) in euren Schoss vergolten habe, V. 7 ihre Sünden und die Sünden ihrer Väter zumal (*ḥašqbōl*), spricht der Herr. Weil sie auf den Bergen Weihrauch geopfert und auf den Höhrn mich entehrt haben, werde ich ihnen ihre Taten zuvörderst in den Schoss messen".

Der Beleg aus Lamy steht innerhalb eines bis auf Bruchstücke verkürzten Textes aus Jes 65,5-7, nicht ohne Varianten und folgende Erklärung. Er lautet übersetzt: "5 und sie sagen...: Komme mir nicht nah... 7 ihre Sünden und die Sünden ihrer Väter stehen *ḥašqbōl* (Lamy: *dupliciter*) vor mir, spricht der Herr. Das heisst: geschrieben stehen sie vor mir, 6 und ich werde sie nicht bedecken, bis ihre Sünden und die Sünden ihrer Väter doppelt (*ba'pā*) von mir vergolten sind. *ḥašqbōl*, das heisst *doppelt* (*'pīpā'īt*), werde ich sie in ihren Schoss und den ihrer Väter Gergelten".

Die hier aufgestellte Behauptung, dass *ḥašqbōl doppelt* bedeute, beruht unverkennbar auf einer unrichtigen Kombination. Theodor bar Kōnai (Ende des 8. Jhdts) erklärt in der 4. *mēmra* seines Scholienbuches als letzten der "schwierigen Ausdrücke" in Jes, ehe er zum Dodekapropheton übergeht, *ḥašqbōl* kurzerhand als *qdāmay*: *vor mir* (ThK 1,275,16). Er so wenig wie der Erklärer bei Lamy, der unter Ephraems Namen geht, kannten das Wort aus

der gesprochenen Sprache. Dieser griff auf Jes 65,6 wie jener auf 65,7. Bei älteren Autoren war das anders. Die Peschitta-Übersetzung von Jes 65,7 und die Mārā bar Serapion-Stelle sind schon erörtert. Es gilt auch für die Zeit des Bischofs Titos von Bostra (3. Jhdt.) und selbst noch für die Briefe des späteren Katholikos ʿĪṣōyahb 111. (etwa um 630 n.Chr.).

Der engere Zusammenhang der Belegstelle TB 117,12 aus dem 3. Buch von "Gegen die Manichäer", griechisch nicht erhalten oder bis jetzt nicht wieder gefunden, ist etwa dieser: "Das ist Vorwurf gegen Vorwurf gesetzt und keine Verteidigung. Denn von den heidnischen Griechen erweisen alle Philosophen einander gleiche Ehren als Griechen, und gleichermassen werden alle im gleichen Mass als heidnische Griechen bei ihnen geehrt, werden berühmt gemacht und erlangen mit ihren Lehren, die einander widersprechen, in gleicher Weise zumal (*ḥašqbōl*) von einander Lob". An den beiden Briefstellen ʿĪṣōyahb 111. (JšBC 21,1. 84,18) kehrt dieselbe Wendung abgewandelt wieder. 21,1: "Heute müssen sie elendig zumal (*ḥašqbōl*) von einander leidem". 84,18: "Daher habe ich nicht an die Bedrängnisse gedacht, die wir haben, da wir in denselben Ehrenstellen (? *šubhē*, honores, τιμαί) zumal (*ḥašqbōl*) von einander leiden".

Wenn mit dem Gesagten die Bedeutung des seltsamen Wortes hinlänglich geklärt ist, so beiben seine Bildung und die Vokale rätselhaft genug. Einen Lösungsversuch hat Abraham Geiger 1864 vorgebracht. *Lex*<sup>2</sup> erwähnt und bezweifelt ihn. Es ist aber schade, dass es, wie auch schon in der 1. Auflage von 1895, die vorausgehende Bedeutungsbestimmung nicht in Betracht zog und völlig unbeachtet liess. Denn bereits damals war G. auf der richtigen Spur, als er *ḥašqbōl* als die richtige Übersetzung von hb. *yaḥdāw* in Jes 65,7 erkannte und diese auch für Spic 44,4 forderte. Wenn er "beide zusammen" und "beides in gleicher Weise" vorschlägt, so ist nur "beide" und "beides" zu viel. Er sagt auch schon richtig, dass das Wort ausser Gebrauch gekommen sei und die Späteren unglücklich geraten hätten. Er bemerkte auch richtig, dass "doppelt (*a'pā*) vergelten" in Jes 65,6 pš sich aus der Wiederholung im Hebr. *šillamti wšillamti* erkläre. Schwieriger wurde es für G., die Wortbildung verständlich zu machen. Er nimmt eine Zusammensetzung aus *ḥd* und *šqbwl* (so) und erklärt das: "eines eine Entsprechung oder entsprechend dem anderen, also: Beides in gleicher Weise". Für *ḥad* verweist er auf damit zusammengesetzte Adverbien, wie denn auch das Synonymon *akḥdā* "zugleich" hier erwähnt werden kann. Er muss sich dann mit einer Kontraktion von *\*ḥadsaqbōl* zu *ḥašqbōl* abfinden. Wer das für unmöglich hält, dem bleibt die Aufgabe zunächst ungelöst.

Päpstliches Bibelinstitut  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rom

R. KÖBERT



## RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

---

### Genesis Bit by Bit<sup>(1)</sup>

---

If Wellhausen, Kuenen and others could have used a personal computer to calculate e.g. the "vocabulary richness", the "mean word length", or other variables of their supposed documentary authors, how much of a difference would that have made in *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*<sup>(2)</sup> and in the *Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek*<sup>(3)</sup>?

One possible effect could have been that we as the readers at an earlier stage would have been made accustomed to the new terminology of "raw data", "error probability", "cluster analysis", etc. recently becoming a part of biblical studies. But, less anachronistically, how much did the former authors rely on the counting of individual words? How much could or can the calculation of word frequencies and the overlap of lexical samples render either contribution to or criticism of a literary theory whose primary aim was not to discriminate between authors, but to describe the gradual development of a complex literary work?

From the reading of the classics of Old Testament critical studies, it becomes clear that the reference to linguistic data often only constitutes a second line of argumentation, apart from the content based arguments. The linguistic arguments, therefore, functioned as a check for a proposed literary analysis. For example, Kuenen, in his *Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek* (43), states that after having registered mutually contradicting narratives, one "a priori" may expect corresponding differences at the linguistic level confirming the difference of authorship. Wellhausen, in *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*<sup>(4)</sup>, emphasizes on several occasions, that it is not possible to discriminate exactly between J and E. In some respects this does not contradict the findings of Radday and Shore, but only reiterates the fact that linguistic data have not necessarily been dealt with as an independent argument in the Documentary Hypothesis. Content-based observations came first.

There seems to be some irony in the fact that both Wellhausen and Radday warn against mechanistically dividing operations in documentary criticism: Radday states, that "mechanistically assigning this or that part to various authors are hardly signs of a proper comprehension of what literature is

(<sup>1</sup>) Y. T. RADDAY-H. SHORE, *Genesis. An Authorship Study in Computer-Assisted Statistical Linguistics* (Analecta Biblica 103). Rome 1985. Biblical Institute Press. I thank my colleague Dr. J. van Riel-Dijk for the correction of my English text.

(<sup>2</sup>) Berlin <sup>3</sup>1899; <sup>4</sup>1963.

(<sup>3</sup>) Leiden <sup>2</sup>1887.

(<sup>4</sup>) *Die Composition*, 14, 29, 35, 208.

and how a writer works" (216; see also 8). Wellhausen praises Kuenen for being 'purified' by him from "hängen gebliebenen Resten des alten Sauersteiges der mechanischen Quellenscheidung"<sup>(5)</sup>. Also in O. Eissfeldt's famous *Hexateuch-Synopse*<sup>(6)</sup> one finds the same warning against using the argument "Gottesnamen" and "Sprachgebrauch" which has been "allzu mechanisch". In this regard some of the criticism of the Documentary Hypothesis current in our days is not always justified.

The similarity of these utterances, however, also reveals the difference in approach, i.e. the concept of the author. In spite of difficulties in distinguishing exactly between J and E, Wellhausen does not doubt their individual existence, whereas Radday does. One may ask what really has been decisive here, the linguistic data, or the concept of an author's activities. We have reason to believe that, even when using his personal computer, Julius Wellhausen would not have changed much of his literary analysis, nor would Radday have changed much of his theory, had he not had access to the large mainframes in Haifa, Tel Aviv or Aachen. It is still the theory of literature that counts, before any machine starts (re)counting of its own accord.

In my opinion it is this — perhaps — simple truth that a biblical scholar should have in mind when trying to read and understand the work of Radday and his colleagues. There is no doubt that Radday and Shore are very well aware of this, as appears from their "Interim Postscript" (215-217). They do not claim to have demolished the Documentary Hypothesis, for it is mainly the distinction of J and E that has been made (more) doubtful now by their statistical linguistic calculations (216, 217; cf. 190, conclusion [c]). Most important is that the authors exactly define the territory for which these methods are valid. They are "dealing... with the overall picture of language habits and no more" (217). Thus, their research can be best estimated when it is regarded as a kind of sophisticated computer-game, played with one very restrictive rule set in advance: only count the directly observable word-level linguistic data. The game is played then to try to falsify the linguistic part of the argumentation in the Documentary Hypothesis.

When discussing the playing of this game, one should concentrate less on the numerous digits and diagrams produced by it, and more on the main rule chosen, due, of course, to the wish to test part of the classical Documentary Hypothesis by means of statistical programs: "language habits and no more". This main rule, as well as the choice to use merely statistical computer programs leads to some basic questions regarding the validity of this method when it is used to describe a work that is the product of tradition such as the book of Genesis.

— What is the relationship between linguistic and literary argumentation? How can linguistic data be used to draw conclusions on 'authors', 'genre' or 'traditional material'?

— Should the contribution of computer-programs be restricted to statistical calculations on individual words?

<sup>(5)</sup> *Die Composition*, 315; see also 315, n. 1.

<sup>(6)</sup> Leipzig 1922; reprint Darmstadt 1978, p. 5.

— How should one account for the differences between synchronical and diachronical textual analysis when a computer-program can only produce an inventory of “language habits” in the final text? Is any room left for diachronical questioning?

With these rather general questions in mind, a number of decisions made by Radday and Shore deserve further discussion:

1. The division of the text into sources and into sorts of discourse: synchronical NHD versus diachronical JEP.
2. The linguistic level of the linguistic criteria or variables.
3. The use of computers in biblical studies.

1. Basic to the methodology of the book is a word-level linguistic analysis of the text of Genesis (16-17). This analysis registers not only the grammatical features of each word such as lemma, number, gender, etc., but also some literary data. To each word a siglum is added that is indicative of the document J, E or P and a second siglum indicating whether a word belongs to N(arrative) sections, to H(uman speech) or to D(ivine speech). This implies that before a single computer program was employed, a number of decisions were taken both on literary and on text-linguistic matters.

First, one acts as if the assignment of words to sources was in all cases equally easily done by the “Documentarians”. The procedure emphasizes that this authorship study has the character of a test: let us assume that the source criticism is really able to attribute each individual word to a source, what linguistic characteristics of these sources could be then calculated? In other words, one has to adopt, or even create, a clear-cut version of the Documentary Hypothesis in order to be able to perform statistical tests. Previous to acceptance by the program package (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences – SPSS) the individual words are forced to react as self-assured respondents without “don’t knows” and “maybe’s”. SPSS, however, does procure the option to assign “missing values” to respondents. It might have been wise and also have done more justice to several versions of the Documentary Hypothesis (see my remarks on Wellhausen), if one had either accepted a lot more uncertainty as a peculiarity of several texts, or had omitted the more complex texts from the statistical procedures.

Second, also the use of the sigla N, H and D causes some trouble, because their text-linguistic status is not clear. Radday correctly states that nowadays we observe in biblical studies a “paradigm shift from the historical to the linguistic” (11), from philology concentrating on the history of a special text to linguistics, concentrating on the language system as such. So there is good reason to try to find new parameters in order to characterize words synchronically, apart from the sigla J, E, P, that belong to a diachronically arguing hypothesis. Now the problem with N, H and D is that they are partly grammatical and partly literary-stylistic in nature. The grammatical question: “Is this text narrative or direct speech?” produces an answer that differs from the literary question: “Who is talking here, the narrator or some actor within the narrative?” Compare Gen 22,14; 32,33 and other verses that can be regarded as the narrator’s direct speech and Gen 44,18 that

belongs to an actor's narrative<sup>(7)</sup>. The question is, therefore, what should be registered: the textual contribution of some actors in the text, or "language habits alone" indeed?

Rabin, discussing the linguistic aspects of Radday's work (218-224), touches upon this, when he speaks of "registers" (socially determined speech) and the grammatical markers of narrative versus those of direct speech. He refers to Gen 24,34-49 as the "only real example of narrative speech" (221). One should add several cases from the Joseph story (e.g. Gen 42,30-34; 44,19-29) and the above mentioned cases of the reversed situation, i.e. the narrator's speech. In my opinion it is important, therefore, to divide the text according to grammatical markers instead of literary actors so as to avoid the creation of ambiguous text samples. I want to emphasize here that the division of the text into "Sorts-of-Discourse" in itself is a good starting point for synchronical literary analysis. At the same time, however, I am also convinced that the particular division chosen, i.e. N, H, D, has less power to prove the unity of Genesis than Radday and his colleagues seem to expect from it:

a. In the introductory chapter it is stated that the 'Sort-of-Discourse' represents a dissection of the text that is — contrary to the alleged Documents — "inherent without question in the book itself" (21). In the "Conclusion" we find the same contention (189): the classification N, H, D "is based on data given in the text" and is "hence not debatable". From the standpoint of grammar though, it still is debatable.

b. On the basis of the statistical calculations it is repeatedly concluded that actually only two sorts of discourse can be distinguished: N and H+D (120, 122, 158, 183, 186, 189), i.e. narrative speech versus direct speech. From the grammatical point of view I would say: What else could one expect to find? That which is found is a direct result of the grammatical criteria described by Rabin<sup>(8)</sup>. The same will also hold for Samuel, Kings, etc. I fail to see why "it goes without question" that this "must of necessity affect the final answer to the question of whether the Documentary Hypothesis is valid or not" (184). If J, E and P all write some correct variant of classical Hebrew, it is to be expected that the three of them will demonstrate a similar linguistic distinction between narrative and discursive language. This does not of necessity prove anything with regard to authorship.

c. It seems to me that the observed contrast between N and the actors H and D is due to the fact that in the book of Genesis the texts of the 'dramatis personae' and the texts according to formal linguistic distinctions largely overlap, because there is less narrative speech present than in other books (though it is more than Rabin suggested). In the book of Deuteronomy, for instance, the dissection of the text according to N, H and D would have been

<sup>(7)</sup> See W. SCHNEIDER, *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch* (München 1974; <sup>2</sup>1983) on the grammatical status of narrative and discursive speech; cf. E. TALSTRA, "Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible", *BO* 35 (1978) 169-174; 39 (1982) 26-38.

<sup>(8)</sup> 220. Cf. SCHNEIDER, *Grammatik*.

much less discriminative, because of the frequent use of embedded speech. How should e.g. Deut 1,39 be classified, where N (cf. 1,1) is quoting Moses (H) quoting God (D) quoting Israel (H)? Again, I consider the subdivision of texts according to Sorts-of-Discourse a useful descriptive tool, but only when it accords with formal grammatical criteria. To suggest one possibility: one should differentiate the labels N, H and D according to the grammatical markers of narrative and direct speech, and also according to the audience: reader of the text, actors in the text. It also might be useful to discriminate between more actors than simply H.

For example: N.n → R (Narrator, narrative, Reader)

H1d → D (Human actor 1, direct speech, God)

H1d → H3 (Human actor 1, direct speech, Human actor 3).

Rabin rightly asks for a closer interaction between discourse analysis and statistical inquiries (224). The present research jumps too hastily from word level information to authorship study, neglecting the text grammatical levels in between. I have no reason to doubt the truth of the figures and percentages discriminating N material from H and D material. But if one does not know how much of this is a predictable product of grammatical paradigm, one cannot decide how much is left over needing a literary explanation, either synchronically (literary style) or diachronically (authorship).

2. Another field where decisions had to be made in advance is the choice of the set of linguistic criteria (23-29). Corresponding to the requirements of the program package designed for sociological inquiries, this set of 54 criteria represents in fact the questionnaire to be answered by a group of 96 respondents: text samples of about 200 words each (22-23; 61-62). The idea is that these questions and their answers could serve as "finger prints" (cf. the quotation by Talmon [227]), i.e. the speech habits from which authors could, or could not, be detected. The 54 grammatical variables deal with word length (nr. 1-10); construct and absolute state, root formation of the verb (11-16); conjunctions (17-19) and the transition between word categories (e.g. prep.-noun; noun-verb) (20-54).

As in the former paragraph, I do not doubt that it is useful to submit the texts to this type of inquiry, such as in case of testing the distinction between the first and the second Isaiah, as Radday has shown before. But it seems to me that with respect to Genesis, Radday and his colleagues are acting as if the Documentary Hypothesis claims to be able to propose clearly distinguished sources throughout the entire book. The authors demonstrate in the introductory chapter that they know that such is not the case (8). So what exactly is the value of the linguistic criteria in verifying or falsifying source criticism?

Furthermore, they seem to restrict themselves to the option that only the writers of the Sources are supposed to be the real authors in the view of the literary critics. Should, however, this testing game not also account for texts that refer to traditional material or have been reworked by later editors? It is a well-known fact that since form criticism and redactional criticism have become complementary to source criticism, the concept of 'biblical authors'

has changed: where do they stand between tradition and redaction<sup>(9)</sup>? One cannot be sure what the status is of the answers to Radday's grammatical inquiry that are produced by the 96 respondents, because these texts belong to a tradition work.

In a comparable situation, were a sociologist to use the SPSS package for the statistical analysis of the answers produced by 96 respondents to a set of 54 questions, would he still trust his results if he knew that the answers given could be those of his actual respondents, but equally well could be quotations of answers given on other occasions by the respondent's father, his grandfather or his son?

The given set of criteria is designed for a synchronical linguistic analysis, not for a literary critical type of authorship study:

a. The behaviour of the 54 grammatical variables has been measured only within the predetermined boundaries of both Source and Sort of Speech (e.g. NE: narrative section of E; HJ: human speech section of J, etc.). It would have been more in line with modern biblical research if a computer program had produced an inventory of the behaviour of these variables throughout the whole text, independent of any predefined literary samples. That might have produced the linguistic data useful for consultation by a literary theory on sources or genres.

b. Such a linguistic inventory, however, should also take into consideration grammatical variables of a higher level: phrases and clauses. It appears that the registration of transitions between word categories (var. 20-52) does not yield much information: 11 variables "were found to have zero value throughout the book"<sup>(10)</sup>, all of them belonging to the subset of the transition variables. The rest of them are ambiguous in nature: some refer to phrase structure (e.g.: 20 noun-noun, supposed the first noun has no pronominal suffix), others regard clause types (e.g.: 21 noun-verb; 26 verb-noun). It seems to me that one could better dispense with the registration of transitions, in favor of a grammatically meaningful inventory of phrases and clauses. That will procure the linguistic data to be considered in literary research both of the diachronical and the synchronical type.

3. In the research that Radday and Shore present in their book, computers have not a grammatical-linguistic task, but only a statistical one. In fact their programs do not deal with language at all: what they analyze is a matrix of 53 rows and 96 columns filled with numbers. To summarise my position: the outcome of Cluster Analysis, Factor Analysis and other analyses may be accepted as valid for that matrix<sup>(11)</sup>; however, the question remains,

<sup>(9)</sup> See the well-documented survey by C. HOUTMAN, *Inleiding in de Pentateuch* (Kampen 1980) 96ff; 119ff.

<sup>(10)</sup> 60; compare the procedure followed by D. WICKMAN (47), who eliminates 22 variables with a mean frequency < 7. Twenty-one of them also belong to the transition subset.

<sup>(11)</sup> See however, criticism at this point by S. L. PORTNOY-D. L. PETERSEN, "Genesis, Wellhausen and the Computer: A Response", *ZAW* 69 (1984) 421-425.

whether or not the conclusions drawn from them are also valid for the composition of the book of Genesis<sup>(12)</sup>. Several times one has the feeling that decisions are based on methodological choices made in advance and not dependent on the outcome of the tests, in particular the explanation of linguistic variants not by difference of authors, but by difference of genre and style (184, 189, 190, 209-214). This is the dilemma indeed. A way out could be found, in my opinion, by dealing with linguistic data at higher grammatical levels and involving much more data such as the entire Tanach.

It is precisely this task that very well could be done by computers, if biblical scholars would take time to develop a text grammar of Hebrew surface structure<sup>(13)</sup>, in order to go beyond the usual computer-made concordances (important as they may be) or matrices for statistical research. What biblical research needs is a database of Hebrew (Greek and other) texts that takes into consideration the hierarchical structure of language: why only count phonemes, words and word transitions? One might say, as it is often done, that thus one gets the objective linguistic data. This may be so, but, as I tried to show in the previous sections, if the application of the computer in biblical studies remains at this level, modern technique and classical philological methods never really will come in contact with each other. Statistical testing of prevailing literary hypotheses, though useful if done with more strictly defined linguistic rules, will not be of any assistance to scholars in designing new hypotheses, unless a computer program could give help in the heavy task of searching the texts, e.g. for parallel lexical and syntactical constructions, for the compilation of a survey of clause types, verbal complements, etc.<sup>(14)</sup>.

Radday and Shore apologize a number of times to the reader for the confusing wealth of statistical material produced in their study (53, 181, 215, cf. 3 n. 1). By the time one has finished the task of reading the book, one indeed feels to have earned those apologies. To most biblical exegetes statistics as well as the use of computers is a "Geheimwissenschaft" and it will, I am afraid, continue to be so, if Radday and others do not take the trouble of bringing their disciplines closer to philologists and to the linguistic methods biblical scholars usually work with. A fundamental encounter of computer

<sup>(12)</sup> Cf. the advice given by WICKMAN at p. 46: "Trust the statistician. But with regard to the risks of judgment he (i.e. the reader [E.T.]) had better choose them himself".

<sup>(13)</sup> Cf. some remarks made by H. SCHWEIZER, *Metaphorische Grammatik. Wege zur Integration von Grammatik und Textinterpretation in der Exegese* (AT-SAT 15; St. Ottilien 1981) 47 and 69. R. WONNEBERGER, *Syntax und Exegese* (BET; Frankfurt-am-Main 1979) 273, 297-298.

<sup>(14)</sup> See the possibilities demonstrated by the first generation of programs being developed by the "Werkgroep Informatica", Faculty of Theology, Free University, Amsterdam, in F. POSTMA-E. TALSTRA-M. VERVENNE, *Exodus. Materials in automatic Text Processing. Part I: Morphological, Syntactical and Literary Case Studies* (Amsterdam-Turnhout 1983).

technology and biblical studies, which I consider both inevitable and inspiring<sup>(15)</sup>, can only succeed if both sides accept that they still have a considerable way to go.

Vrije Universiteit  
Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid  
1007 MC Amsterdam (NL)

Eep TALSTRA

(<sup>15</sup>) J. D. BOLTER, *Turing's Man—Western Culture in the Computer Age* (New Haven 1982).

---



## A Computer-generated 'Perfect' Concordance?

---

A recent review by Zippora Talshir (*Bib* 66 [1985] 438-440) of my *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Index to I Esdras* (Chico 1984) seems to raise a few general issues which go beyond those addressed by her with special reference to the *Index*.

According to the reviewer, a tool such as "a concordance produced manually is bound to end up with some mistakes", whereas modern computer technology, she would no doubt argue, is capable of producing "a perfect index"; by 'perfect' she apparently means 'immaculate' or 'error-free'. It is granted that a modern computer can eliminate many types of errors which we humans are inevitably prone to, and that it can perform certain tasks with incredible speed and efficiency, even *ad nauseam*. These days, however, more and more biblical scholars are acquiring basic skills in computer technology and are in a position to appreciate the obvious advantages it holds for their profession and also fundamental limitations computers are subject to. Those scholars perceive that, until a fifth-generation computer with artificial intelligence superior to human intelligence is delivered, the use of a computer, however sophisticated, would not produce a work which can be claimed to be above criticism and beyond dispute where it involves the kinds of interpretation and analysis of which computers are incapable.

Emanuel Tov, for instance, (with whom Talshir works) is realistic enough to admit to a degree of subjectivity and limitation inherent in the production of computer generated tools and works; see E. Tov, "Computer assisted alignment of the Greek-Hebrew equivalents of the Masoretic text and the Septuagint", in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (Madrid 1985) 221-242.

The following examples will show that there will always be scope for interpretation and disagreement, and that we are not dealing here merely with mechanical "alignment".

As regards 8,61 (Ezra 8,33) σταθὲν... παρεδόθη (על יד מרמות נשקל... על יד, Talshir thinks that, in the light of such passages as 8,58 (Ezra 8,29); 8,56 (Ezra 8,26); 1,6 (2 Chr 35,6); 2,10 (Ezra 1,8); 8,6 (7,9), "ιστάναι... παραδίδόναι represents יד על... שקל, or better, ιστάναι stands for שקל and παραδίδόναι for יד על". The proposed latter equivalence, which is between a verb and a prepositional phrase, is rather striking. It seems to us more likely that the translator mentally supplied the verb נתן or thought that the verb שקל may imply the added notion of נתן. (Pace Talshir, not παραδίδόναι, but its simplex occurs in 2,10).

Talshir's review points up the fact that there are at least two possible ways of looking at constituent elements in a Hebrew/Aramaic text and its

Greek translation. Whilst I indicated that in 2,18 (4,14) ἐνεργεῖται τὰ κατὰ τὸν ναόν (מלך היכלא מלחא) the Greek ἐνεργεῖται has no Semitic word corresponding to it, Talshir believes that there is "no room for any difference of opinion. The translator obviously didn't understand the meaning of his Vorlage, but there is no doubt that ἐνεργεῖται τὰ κατὰ... constitutes his interpretation of" the Aramaic. If one is to assume that the translator failed to understand the original Aramaic text, how is one supposed to go about matching each Greek word with a corresponding Aramaic one? She further asserts that the phonetic similarity between Hebrew מלאכה and Aram. מלח / מלחא could have contributed to such an interpretation. Is it safe to assume that the pronunciation of het and that of kaph rafé in the early Hellenistic period — assuming again that the spirantisation of the plosives was complete by that time — were similar to each other as is the case with a large segment of Modern Hebrew speakers?

Since the reviewer characterises the translator of I Esdras as free and imaginative, she presumably would admit that some elements in the Greek of the book can be said to have resulted from free translation, thus having no Semitic equivalent, although I cannot be absolutely certain as to what she means when she says: "I would not agree with the handling of the whole section of words, labelled 'fr'". (Reference to this symbol was inadvertently left out of the introduction to *Index*, but the reviewer has correctly deciphered it as 'free translation'.) Talshir objects to my application of the symbol to ἐπικαλεῖν שכן (Pael) in 6,32 (Ezra 6,12) οὗ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπικαλεῖται ἐκεῖ (= שכן שמה תמה). To her mind, *šakkēn* is an equivalent to ἐπικαλεῖν, as Qal *šāḥan* or Piel *šikkēn* is in the Pentateuch as many as seven times — nine times, in fact; a quick glance at Hatch and Redpath would show why the miscount occurred. In my introduction, however, I indicated that our *Index* is concerned with what Hebrew or Aramaic word is being translated by means of a given Greek word or phrase. It is quite obvious that in this particular case the translator chose not to translate the common enough Hebrew/Aramaic verb with one of its usual equivalents, and he must also have been aware that the more usual 'hyponym', to use a highly convenient term coined by L. J. McGregor in his recent monograph, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel* (Atlanta 1985), is *nigrā'*; this unique rendition was theologically motivated according to Z. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese* (Leipzig 1851) 85, 216. Only a mechanistic approach would list this Aramaic/Hebrew hyponym as equivalent of the Greek verb under discussion, and 'align' the two. Let it further be noted that in one of the passages alluded to by Talshir, Exod 29,45, the merely formal nature of the equivalence is all the more striking, since the word *šēm* is missing and consequently the logical object of the Greek verb is different: καὶ ἐπικληθήσονται ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ (ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל). Whilst one can clearly recognise a common pattern of thinking in all these passages, an index of words or a concordance is hardly the right place for recording such recognition.

Another major problem is that of retroversion from Greek to Hebrew/Aramaic. I for one would rather err on the conservative and over-cautious side, and venture to reconstruct the underlying Semitic text, only insofar as such a procedure can be justified in the light of the existing *textus*

*receptus*, actually attested variant readings, or the plausibility of common scribal irregularities such as haplography, dittography, homoioteleuton, misreading or mishearing of similarly looking or sounding letters or sounds, or influence of associated or parallel passages, namely, some external and tangible factors over which one can claim a reasonable degree of control. (Some of us will still remember an acute embarrassment which was suffered by an eminent biblical philologist, who was reputed to possess superb expertise in Hebrew and Greek alike and had ventured to produce a Hebrew version of Ecclesiasticus prior to the coming to light of the Genizah fragments in his lifetime.) Thus, whilst one may be able to defend matching μεγαλειότης with ד in 1,4 (2 Chr 35,4: MT מִכְתָּב) in view of the LXX reading at 2 Chr 35,4 and the general context, one cannot be so sure that a 'perfect' index to I Esdras can be written on the assumption that in 2,18 (Ezra 4,15) the translator's Vorlage actually read הוּ עַל מַלְכָּא טַב or he had something like that on his mind, for in what Talshir calls "exactly parallel context" (Ezra 5,17) where this Aramaic clause actually occurs, the LXX reads εἰ κρίνεται, whereas in 2,18 we have εἰν φαίνεται σοι. Nor does Talshir sound any more convincing as regards 9,54 (Neh 8,12) τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσιν, for which she seems to be arguing for the possibility of reconstructing בָּנֵי לֹא יָדְעוּ, which shows the same Greek wording in 9,52 (Neh 8,10). However, a close look at the Greek text at 9,54 indicates that it probably did not follow the Hebrew as closely as in 9,52 and the translator let himself be influenced by the former verse.

Finally, what is one to do with Greek variants? Talshir sounds dissatisfied with my ignoring of them, though on one occasion I did register my strong reservations on Hanhart's reading; s.v. κάπρον. It is indeed a weighty and difficult question. One thing is however clear in my mind: one needs to be selective, for there is obviously no justification whatsoever for attempting to match a Greek reading which did not originate with reference to a Semitic Vorlage, but represents a merely inner-Greek evolution of the text in some form or other. So I would submit that, unless one entertains rather strong reservations on the *modus operandi* adopted by the Göttingen school, and barring individual readings proposed as lemma in their edition to which one may take exception, the path chosen by us may be said to be quite defensible. To record dutifully all variant readings of selected major uncials was justifiable only in the days of Hatch and Redpath.

The University of Melbourne  
Dept. of Middle Eastern Studies  
Parkville, Victoria 3052  
Australia

Takamitsu MURAOKA

## RECENSIONES

---

### Novum Testamentum

Paul KARIAMADAM, V.C., *The Zacchaeus Story [Lk. 19,1-10]. A Redaction-Critical Investigation* (Pontifical Institute Publications 42). XII-132 p. 21 × 14. Kerala, India 1985. Pontifical Institute of Theology and Philosophy.

Scholarly work in Scripture is moving out into the so-called "Third World" and this book is a pleasant proof. The reviewer is not always enthusiastic about theses defended at his own institution (what professor is?), but this portion of a dissertation defended at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1983 is worth remarking.

Kariamadam builds his case carefully and thoroughly. Particularly effective is the parallelism drawn between the cure of the paralytic (Luke 5,17-26) and the Zacchaeus story to illustrate Jesus' salvific mission. And between the call of Levi (Luke 5,27-32) and the Zacchaeus story to show that Jesus is being presented as the savior of sinners (cf. pp. 48-53).

Among the points made in the analysis of the vocabulary is the fact that *δίδωμι* and *ἀποδίδωμι* are present tenses used with future meaning. The interpretation is correct and crucial to Kariamadam's case. He cites authors in abundance in support of his view, but more persuasive by far would have been a discussion of other New Testament texts where the present tense is clearly used with future force in order to establish a category into which the relevant verbs in the Zacchaeus story clearly fit.

In contrast to the convincing nature of the exposition regarding comparison between the Zacchaeus episode on the one hand the cure of the paralytic and call of Levi on the other, the structure-analysis given by Kariamadam on p. 54 seems contrived and pointless. It is impossible for the casual listener/reader to keep in mind all the elaborate repetitions and symmetries. Certain key words naturally remain in the memory, but they are words which suggest meaningful attitudes, e.g., *σταθείς* in 19,8 which, as Kariamadam shows (p. 34), has a thematic value because used by Luke to introduce solemn acts. Pointing out such key elements is useful for grasping what Luke is about and is psychologically credible from the standpoint of reader/listener comprehension. But the complicated outline given on p. 54 of the pericope seems to be only what it actually is — the contrived over-exegesis of a scholar at his desk.

Kariamadam discusses the importance of humility in the search for Jesus and correctly points out the way this humility is conveyed by Luke with regard to Zacchaeus by emphasizing his smallness of stature (pp. 15-17). He

could have expanded the idea by remarking on the obvious humility shown by a dignified official who does not hesitate to climb a tree in search of something he deems of value. The remarks of R. Brunner ("Jesus begegnet Zachäus", *Judaica* 10 [1954] 33) are in place: "Gewiss, es *kostet* jeden etwas, der erkennen will, wer Jesus war. Im Grunde genommen kostet es alle dasselbe. Wer ihn sehen und erkennen will, muss sich in der Regel demütigen. Es kostet ein Absteigen. Das Klettern auf den Maulbeerbaum ist für einem Mann wie Zachäus sicher ein Absteigen gewesen. Er hätte es bestimmt nicht getan, wenn er nicht für einen Augenblick hätte vergessen können, dass er Zachäus, der Obsterste am Zoll von Jericho war". Brunner's article is not cited in Kariamadam's bibliography, probably because it was originally a radio sermon. But even preachers have insights into texts which exegetes can make use of when they are insights which genuinely illumine the text.

Finally, it is not out of place to cite the following words of the Preface written by Bishop Sebastian Mankuzhikary, Auxiliary Bishop of Chochin and Chairman of the Commission for Theology of the Kerala Catholic Bishops' Council:

The pros and cons of the theology of liberation are much discussed today and one often doubts and asks the question, "if the Gospel is preached to the poor, then what about the rich?" Luke, the evangelist of the poor, gives us an answer to this question by means of the Zacchaeus pericope. This pericope tells us that the rich people also will be saved if they are ready to share their wealth with the poor and undergo radical conversion by accepting Jesus as their Lord (Kyrios) and Saviour. When they do this they too belong to the category of the 'poor'. For in the Bible all those who completely depend on the Lord for their salvation are qualified as the 'poor'. A point that is forgotten frequently is the fact that Jesus is the Saviour in the full sense of the word. Both the materially poor and rich are included in the category of those saved by Him. He does not exclude anyone from the Kingdom of God if one is ready for radical conversion. The Lord does not hate and condemn the rich man Zacchaeus, but he transforms him into a new person who accepts the Lord and is ready to share.

Words of wisdom, these. A suitable preface to a book which, all things considered, has its share of wisdom words as well.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

### Vetus Testamentum

Manfred OEMING, *Gesamtbiblische Theologien der Gegenwart*. 266 p. Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1985. W. Kohlhammer Verlag. Paperback DM. 69,—.

1. Nelle acque ormai quiete dello stagno della teologia dell'Antico Testamento s'inserisce quest'importante studio sulle Teologie bibliche dei due Testamenti. Lavoro che si presenta come uno *status quaestionis*, una bibliografia ragionata, ma che è in realtà molto di più in quanto ricco di osservazioni critiche e di spunti originali.

Se parlo di acque quiete intendo dire che a circa un quarto di secolo dalla pubblicazione della Teologia del von Rad (opera che come l'autore a p. 15 considero il punto obbligato di partenza per ogni indagine della situazione odierna, cfr. *Prot* 39 [1984] 1-17), è accaduto che, dopo le prime polemiche ed i primi consensi, gli spunti e le proposte dello studioso di Heidelberg non sono stati ricevuti quasi da nessuno, per cui la Teologia dell'Antico Testamento ha continuato a fluire nei canali convenzionali. Non è uscita, infatti, finora alcuna Teologia dell'Antico Testamento che abbia ripreso e sviluppato in maniera originale quanto il von Rad proponeva. Si tratta di un fatto sconcertante, se pensiamo alle lodi che il von Rad ha ricevuto dalla maggior parte degli studiosi, ma le sue cause appaiono abbastanza chiare: in primo luogo le proposte del von Rad erano difficilmente applicabili ad una Teologia dell'Antico Testamento, e prova ne è il fatto che la di lui Teologia assomiglia piuttosto ad una *alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte* che ad una Teologia, anche se dotata di molti ed importanti spunti teologici. In secondo luogo l'impostazione sostanzialmente conservatrice del pensiero del von Rad legava questa Teologia alla tradizione biblica, anche se ne segnalava ogni tanto, con disappunto e dolore, il divario esistente nei confronti di una ricostruzione storico-critica delle origini d'Israele, quale appariva in altre opere. A quest'impostazione storicamente conservatrice possiamo aggiungere lo uso indiscriminato di concetti quali la «storia della salvezza» (p. 67), di «tempo» (elemento ripreso di pari passo da T. Boman, *Das hebräische Denken in Vergleich mit dem griechischen* (Göttingen 1952); infine quello di «tipologia», strutturata secondo lo schema «promessa ed adempimento». Si aggiunga infine che il von Rad non operava con l'ipotesi di uno storico dtr., per cui si precludeva ogni possibilità di una sintesi a ritroso ed in avanti.

Ben venga dunque un volume che, oltre a dirci come stanno le cose oggi, ci presenta anche una serie di proposte nuove ed alternative.

2. Qual è il posto dell'Antico Testamento nella teologia e nella Chiesa cristiana, specialmente se confrontato con quello del Nuovo? La problematica non è nuova e risale alla polemica antignostica e specialmente a quella contro Marcione. La Chiesa, come sappiamo, decise contro le tesi dell'eretico dell'Asia Minore, e dalla fine del II sec. l'Antico Testamento ebbe il posto assicurato nel Canone. Ma non sempre senza qualche incidente di percorso:

ciò che nell'Antico Testamento non si otteneva mediante l'esegesi ordinaria, veniva ottenuto con l'esegesi allegorica, snaturando così i testi, ai quali veniva fatto dire proprio quello che non dicevano. Da Marcione fino ad Adolf von Harnack, ma anche subito dopo la II guerra mondiale (e non parlo dei cosiddetti *Deutsche Christen*, i quali dipendevano in gran parte dall'ideologia nazionalsocialista) le polemiche si sono riaccese in occasione di alcuni scritti programmatici presentati dai collaboratori del *Biblischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, e non sono mancati, specialmente in Germania ed in campo protestante, autori i quali vedevano nell'Antico Testamento, non già «storia della salvezza», ma «storia del fallimento» umano, «storia della dannazione». Frattanto si sono inseriti nel dibattito anche poche, ma qualificate voci ebraiche, provenienti specialmente dall'Ebraismo riformista e conservatore, le quali rivendicano per sé una disciplina che la Chiesa credeva le appartenesse ormai da epoca immemorabile. Pronunciamenti da parte cattolica e protestante hanno poi presentato l'Ebraismo sotto una luce diversa da quella tradizionale, conducendo a diverse valutazioni anche dell'uso che gli Ebrei fanno della loro Scrittura.

Lo stagno è dunque quieto per quello che riguarda la successione di G. von Rad; appare però piuttosto agitato se guardiamo altrove. E attraverso queste discussioni M. Oeming vuole fornirci una guida, una specie di stradario: ogni opinione viene esaminata da un duplice punto di vista: quello storico-esegetico e quello ideologico, questo ultimo termine inteso nel senso di un'indagine conoscitiva del fondamento ermeneutico-filosofico dei singoli concetti (p. 14); e il punto di partenza è appunto l'opera del von Rad.

3. Nella terza parte del vol. II della sua Teologia, G. von Rad esamina il problema dell'unità sostanziale dei due Testamenti (p. 20 ss.). Segue da parte dell'Oeming un esame approfondito delle varie componenti del pensiero del von Rad, specialmente per quello che riguarda la sua apparente parentela sul piano ideologico con l'opera di H.-G. Gadamer. Qui l'autore (p. 34 ss.) svolge il proprio assunto in maniera chiara e convincente, specialmente là dove indica gli elementi comuni ai due studiosi (p. 42 ss.). Interessante è la conclusione alla quale perviene: che nonostante questa comunanza di molti elementi, non è possibile parlare di dipendenza letteraria: in molti punti il von Rad è anche sostanzialmente indipendente dal Gadamer, e si tratta di punti di rilievo. Però rimane interessante il fatto che il Gadamer è stato criticato proprio per quegli elementi che il von Rad ha in comune con lui! Con ragione l'Oeming segnala (p. 77 ss.) l'esistenza anche nel von Rad della medesima ambivalenza che altri hanno riscontrato nel Gadamer: «da un lato l'immagine dell'esegeta radicale e critico, degno discepolo di Albrecht Alt..., dall'altro l'immagine di un carismatico conservatore, che in pia parzialità cerca di leggere nell'Antico Testamento una testimonianza di Cristo, che non esita davanti ad un *sacrificium intellectus*, quando si tratta di difendere la cristianità e l'ecclesialità dell'Antico Testamento». Con ragione l'Oeming attribuisce al von Rad un'immagine bifronte, come quella di Giano; il che per altro non va inteso come una debolezza o addirittura come elemento schizofrenico, ma che, invece, costituisce la grandezza del personaggio in quanto teologo. D'altra parte qui troviamo il tallone d'Achille del suo lavoro: le sue varie componenti si trovano in una relazione poco chiara e difficile da chiarire, cosa della quale

lo stesso von Rad era del resto pienamente conscio, cfr. il poscritto al vol. II della Teologia, dalla 4<sup>a</sup> ed. in avanti.

4. I pochi autori che hanno seguito il von Rad sul cammino dell'esegesi cristologica vengono tutti criticati dall'Oeming (p. 85 ss.), non fosse perché la Chiesa primitiva non è l'unica comunità che si richiama all'Antico Testamento. Esso «non è come una stanza con una sola porta che si apre in direzione del Nuovo Testamento. Ha molte porte e s'apre in direzione di molti lati» (G. Fohrer, cit. dallo Oeming): la setta di Qumrân, l'apocalittica, il Giudaismo rabbinico, Filone ed i suoi seguaci ed anche l'Islâm. Un'altra critica appare presso J. Barr: l'esegesi tipologica non è chiaramente distinta dalla allegoria, se l'esaminiamo sul piano storico (p. 92).

5. Una posizione particolare occupano due studiosi dell'Università di Tubinga, H. Gese e P. Stuhlmacher, ed uno di Magonza, H. Seebass. Essi tutti propongono una Teologia di tutta la Bibbia, dell'Antico e del Nuovo Testamento, considerati nella loro unità canonica. Il secondo e il terzo si rifanno al primo, mentre i primi due insistono sulla continuità non interrotta tra i due Testamenti, nonostante la diversità delle lingue. Anche il Gese ha parecchi punti di contatto col Gadamer nella sua valutazione della storia della tradizione. Ma la critica non può mancare in questi casi: è certo vero (e H. Gese lo mostra con «grande dottrina e capacità esegetica», p. 111) che esiste una continuità tra l'Antico ed il Nuovo Testamento, ma il Gese, invece di limitarsi a «qualche elemento», intende «tutto», in quanto il Nuovo Testamento sarebbe il punto focale nel quale s'incontrano logicamente la *tôrâh*, la sapienza, la profezia e l'apocalittica. Ma tale tesi appare insostenibile sul piano storico, non fosse perché esclude per il Nuovo Testamento l'eredità ellenistica, un elemento di grande importanza. Poi vale quanto detto poc'anzi per l'esegesi cristologica. Leggermente diverso perché seriamente impegnato della problematica del nostro tempo è P. Stuhlmacher, il quale mette in rilievo il termine «riconciliazione» (p. 124 ss.). Come proposta egli presenta un elemento dedotto da P. Ricœur: i testi sono intraducibili nella lingua corrente, possono essere soltanto oggetto di *applicatio* nella prassi della vita quotidiana (cit. a p. 127). D'altra parte le lamentele dello Stuhlmacher sulle condizioni deplorabili delle scienze esegetiche oggi potrebbero in realtà nascondere una polemica contro il metodo storico-critico in sé, per cui, se guardiamo bene, egli non sembra credere in quel metodo storico-critico che pure esige dagli altri, a causa di possibili conseguenze dannose per la fede! Ma si tratta di obiezioni marginali. La principale è che le sue esigenze non possono «essere tradotte in prassi esegetica» (p. 132 s.), come l'Oeming mostra in forma convincente. Né aiuta la proposta di Henri Clavier di considerare il Gesù storico come criterio per una teologia di tutta la Bibbia.

6. Il motivo della «storia della salvezza» presente in G. von Rad, che sembrava contrastare con quello *kerygmatico* barthiano del primato della Parola, ha dato occasione ed alcuni teologi e filosofi di Heidelberg, in parte suoi discepoli, di sviluppare un programma sintetizzato nella formula «salvezza come storia» (*Heil als Geschichte*). Il suo rappresentante e diffusore principale è stato Wolfhart Pannenberg. In essa si faceva riferimento ai «grandi atti di Dio nella storia» come veicolo di rivelazione (p. 139 ss.), mentre l'apocalittica doveva servire da elemento unificatore dei due Testamenti. Anche questa



volta il difetto appare nella definizione dell'Antico Testamento *tout court* come «libro di storia», mentre l'apocalittica si rivela problematica perché poco sviluppata nell'Antico Testamento, e frammentaria nel Nuovo.

Per altri l'elemento della «storia della salvezza» è stato oggetto di una critica di fondo. Per F. Hesse (p. 155 ss.) può essere normativa soltanto la ricostruzione storico-critica della storia d'Israele, non quella *kerygmatica*. I critici dello Hesse gli hanno opposto però che un esegeta non può operare con un concetto moderno, positivista della storia, ma deve cercare invece d'inserirsi empaticamente nelle categorie di pensiero dell'epoca. E se guardiamo da questo punto di vista, vediamo che una «storia della salvezza» è ampiamente attestata sia nell'Antico che nel Nuovo Testamento. Anche fuori della teologia di lingua tedesca si è del resto operato con questo concetto, ed uno degli esempi più noti è quello di Ernst Bloch; il concetto ha avuto una parte importante, com'è noto, nella teologia cattolica del Concilio Vaticano II.

7. Con l'applicazione alla teologia delle varie discipline linguistiche entriamo nell'ambito di una teologia del linguaggio. Iniziò con lo studio di singoli vocaboli considerati concetti-chiave. Importante è qui l'opera di Herbert Haag, il quale sottolinea l'importanza di certe parole, correndo certamente il rischio d'inserirle in una ricerca di tipo dogmatico. Pericolo al quale egli è però riuscito a sfuggire. Un altro fautore di quest'approccio è il maestro dell'Oeming, A. H. J. Gunneweg. Nella sua opera *Vom Verstehen des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen 1977), egli manifesta anzitutto la coscienza del problema che l'Antico Testamento ha spesso presentato per la Chiesa, in quanto testimonianza di una religione *pre* cristiana e quindi *non* cristiana. Egli respinge ogni Teologia di tutta la Bibbia, ma anche l'esegesi tipologica, quella storico-tradizionale e la «storia della salvezza», giungendo così, «*via negationis* all'esaltazione del modello linguistico». Le ragioni che presenta sono le seguenti: secondo il Gunneweg la salvezza, compiuta in Cristo, non può essere obiettivata, studiata empiricamente, ma è «una salvezza entrata a far parte di un avvenimento linguistico e pertanto da proclamare» (cit. da Oeming, p. 166). Essa deve essere quindi sempre nuovamente annunciata all'uomo. Lo stesso *kérygma* neotestamentario, elemento normativo per ogni annuncio della salvezza divina, usa per il proprio annuncio evangelico in gran parte il linguaggio dell'Antico Testamento. E questo diviene così «lo strumento che rende possibile la predicazione escatologica», acquistando, anche se non propriamente cristiano, «dignità cristiana». In questo il Gunneweg segue, come già prima G. von Rad, la filosofia idealistica del linguaggio, da Herder e Humboldt a Heidegger e Gadamer; per essa la lingua non è «un involucro verbale e forma mutevole a piacere di contenuti da comunicare», ma «spiegazione del mondo e dell'esistenza» (*Vom Verstehen*, 188-189). E questi elementi vengono compresi nella medesima maniera dal mondo dell'Antico Testamento come da quello del Nuovo, in contrapposizione al mondo greco, umanistico ed idealistico.

Anche al Gunneweg sono state rivolte non poche critiche. Una è quella di affermare che l'Antico Testamento non darebbe un contributo immediato alla teologia cristiana, ma soltanto attraverso il linguaggio comune ai due Testamenti. Per altri egli strapperebbe l'Antico Testamento all'Ebraismo,

usurpandone il possesso e legittimando così sul piano teologico l'antica tesi della diseredazione dell'Ebraismo; tale posizione nei confronti del Gunneweg viene considerata giustamente dall'Oeming come assurda (p. 171). Altri hanno sostenuto che il Gunneweg elimina il concetto di S. Scrittura, sostituendolo con una collezione sparsa di singoli testi, il che ci conduce ad una forma di soggettivismo ostile sia alla tradizione che alla Chiesa; altra obiezione che l'Oeming considera infondata (p. 173 ss.): vero è invece che Gunneweg s'interessa proprio alla Chiesa ed alla sua predicazione! Altre critiche vorrebbero che Gunneweg avesse messo in maggiore evidenza l'elemento del Nome divino da un lato, si fosse invece astenuto dall'altro dal trattare il fenomeno del linguaggio in maniera aliena dell'Antico Testamento.

8. L'affermazione di G. von Rad che l'Antico Testamento non avrebbe un «centro», ma soltanto una «quantità di teologie» ha suscitato un vespaio di discussioni (p. 182 ss.). La cosa vale del resto anche per il Nuovo Testamento, sicché il *kérygma* acquista una «variabilità» che motiva a sua volta la pluralità di teologie e di gruppi che ad esse si richiamano già nella Chiesa primitiva. Anche questa tesi suscitò a suo tempo discussioni veementi, anche se, dopo circa un quarto di secolo di distanza, dobbiamo riconoscere che E. Käsemann aveva ragione. Orbene, il tentativo di fare del Canone veterotestamentario l'elemento unificante proposto da B.S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia-London 1979), viene esaminato dall'Oeming, il quale mostra anzitutto le tappe del pensiero del Childs, dai primi tentativi alla sua Introduzione all'Antico Testamento. Col suo tentativo Childs dimostra la propria preoccupazione per la dimensione teologica della esegesi, prescindendo per altro dalla sua scientificità. Quest'ultimo elemento egli vede come sempre meno controllabile, sempre più complesso, e ciò non solo da parte del laico colto ed interessato, ma anche da parte dello specialista. Il problema, concorda l'Oeming, è reale, ma il rimedio proposto si rivela pericoloso: il pericolo è quello di sminuire il valore dell'esegesi critico-scientifica. Non potrebbe essere questa una forma di evasione dalle difficoltà, reali per certo, di una trattazione in sede storica? E il quadro che il Childs traccia della Teologia dell'Antico Testamento e biblica in generale non è forse troppo fosco ed approssimativo? Per es. il fatto che la critica scientifica discuta tesi, opinioni e metodi senza giungere ad un consenso è prova solo di confusione e d'incontrollabilità? Non si tratta piuttosto di elementi inerenti alle difficoltà obiettive del testo? Deve la redazione finale essere sempre considerata normativa? Il Canone stesso non è anch'esso il prodotto di un processo lungo e complesso? Autori e redattori non tendono a sparire dietro alla grandezza anonima del Canone?

9. Non sono mancati neanche modelli a base psicoanalitica, specialmente gli scritti di S. Freud e di C. G. Jung e dei loro discepoli; ma si tratta di lavori che, anche se spesso ampiamente pubblicizzati, non hanno dato contributi importanti alle scienze bibliche.

10. Le tesi finali dell'autore (p. 215 ss.) devono considerarsi provvisorie, dato che il dibattito è ancora in corso. È possibile riassumerle e schematizzarle secondo i seguenti punti:

a) Viene da molti sentita la necessità di una Teologia di tutta la Bibbia.

b) La fattibilità di un tale progetto appare però dubbia, sia per quello che riguarda le sue premesse filosofiche e sistematico-teologiche, sia sul piano pratico.

c) Molti propugnatori di una Teologia di tutta la Bibbia non sanno valorizzare ed a volte neanche riconoscono la validità del metodo storico-critico. Ciò può avvenire in vari modi e con diversa intensità, ma finisce in ogni caso per disconoscere il valore del testo, al cui studio questo metodo tende.

d) Le varie tesi dibattute nell'ambito della Teologia biblica sono anzitutto tesi filosofiche, non teologiche.

e) Decisioni di tipo sistematico e teologico s'inseriscono in forma rilevante nella preparazione di ogni Teologia di tutta la Bibbia e si riconoscono elementi quali *de revelatione*, *de Israël*, *de Christo*, *de ecclesia*.

f) Alla base della Teologia biblica sta la pluralità delle premesse filosofiche, di quelle sistematico-teologiche, delle Teologie dell'Antico Testamento e di quelle del Nuovo Testamento.

11. Le conclusioni del lavoro dell'Oeming sono le seguenti: di fronte alla situazione di apparente stallo nella quale ci troviamo, dobbiamo evitare sia «la ritirata nella rassegnazione scettica», sia una «fuga in avanti verso forme postcritiche di esegesi» (p. 226 ss.). Ma per non cadere in uno di questi due elementi dobbiamo cercare un fondamento teorico per la Teologia biblica «che faccia della necessità dell'inevitabile pluralismo una virtù». Il pluralismo va accettato in linea di principio ed integrato in modello. È questa una problematica che la teologia biblica ha in comune con tutte le scienze umanistiche, e che si può circoscrivere con la seguente domanda: quali rapporti vi sono tra la conoscenza storica in continuo sviluppo e la possibilità di pronunciamenti normativi? Come possiamo ritenere elementi legittimamente validi per il presente nel flusso del divenire e del progredire della storia? È ancora possibile pronunciare dei giudizi di valore in una situazione caratterizzata dal pluralismo?

Vari filosofi, tra gli altri H. Rickerts e, nella sua scia, M. Weber, si sono occupati del problema, senza però giungere a conclusioni accettabili.

Nell'Antico Testamento abbiamo a che fare anzitutto con testi (p. 232 ss.), testi che si tratta di analizzare e d'interpretare. Il singolo testo dovrà essere messo in relazione con un elemento normativo, che per il Cristiano potrà essere solo il Nuovo Testamento. Quest'operazione si compie mediante un atto logico. Ma poiché anche il Nuovo Testamento ha un ampio spettro di teologie cristiane, questo compito è tutt'altro che semplice ed ovvio. Pertanto viene effettuato secondo criteri di confessione, di premesse filosofiche, di convinzione politica, per menzionare solo alcuni elementi. Qui dunque il momento della confessione della fede deve avere piena cittadinanza. E dovrà essere spiegato anche il significato del concetto di «valore» in questo contesto.

Giungiamo così ad un nesso tra lavoro storico-esegetico e lavoro sistematico-teologico. Oeming rifiuta quindi (p. 234) la separazione di questi due campi, come una tradizione di ormai oltre 150 anni considera indispensabile e come viene tutt'ora proposto da alcuni studiosi: infatti se un determinato

rapporto non esiste sul piano esegetico, non potrà esistere neanche su quello sistematico!

Il valore «cristiano», qualcosa dunque come un «canone nel Canone», va sviluppato secondo un progetto sistematico-teologico, verificabile e comprensibile anche per chi non ne accetta le premesse; in tal modo esso esce dalla soggettività e può essere mediato e dibattuto. Una volta che le premesse del proprio *partner* nella discussione sono note, ognuno può verificare i suoi argomenti ed i suoi giudizi di valore. È un metodo sperimentato da tempo e con successo nel dialogo ecumenico. D'altra parte l'accettazione del pluralismo e la coscienza del carattere storico e quindi mutevole e superabile di ogni teoria biblico-teologica non ci deve far cadere nel relativismo soggettivistico. Il fatto che oggi pensiamo diversamente da quello che si pensava duecento anni orsono e da quello che si penserà fra duecento anni non ci libera dall'obbligo di ricercare una visione adeguata al giorno d'oggi. Le Teologie di tutta la Bibbia vengono e vanno e devono assumersi le proprie responsabilità solo per l'epoca nella quale sono state prodotte. Del resto lo stesso Antico Testamento è a volte ambivalente e quindi equivoco in non poche sue affermazioni, si pensi solo alla relazione tra fede ed opere in Abramo, Gen 15 e 22!

L'autore conclude segnalando come dati storici fattuali debbano essere sempre di nuovo interrogati per scoprire il loro valore cristiano. L'Antico Testamento va misurato col Nuovo, ma anche il Nuovo Testamento dev'essere misurato sull'Antico. Così la Teologia biblica appare allo stesso tempo come una disciplina storico-esegetica e una disciplina dogmatica. Ne risulta una forma complessa di ricerca cristiana della verità, sulla base delle tensioni di tutta la Bibbia.

12. Questo sommario dell'opera dell'Oeming rivela un lavoro di notevole importanza, condotto con mano sicura e competente. L'autore ha veramente rimosso le acque dello stagno, dandoci non solo uno studio di tipo bibliografico, ma anche critiche pertinenti alle varie posizioni e proposte alternative originali. Con questa trattazione il dibattito ha fatto un passo avanti. È per questo che raccomando questo libro per una traduzione in italiano.

Alcune questioni sono però state ignorate o trattate in maniera incompleta. Ne elenco solo le seguenti, che mi paiono particolarmente notevoli:

a) Come ho segnalato nel mio studio del 1984, uno dei principale teologi della Bibbia negli Stati Uniti è stato G.E. Wright, più noto forse come archeologo. M. Oeming segnala più volte di essere scarsamente competente nei riguardi della teologia statunitense, ed è certamente meglio dirlo subito che scrivere poi delle cose inesatte; d'altra parte non mi sembra che questa posizione sia accettabile, specialmente nel caso del Wright. Se scriviamo sulla Teologia biblica, non possiamo imporci delle limitazioni di tipo nazionale. Nel caso del Wright, molte conclusioni che attribuiamo normalmente a Gerhard von Rad e a W. Pannenberg (sopra, § 6) erano estate raggiunte indipendentemente da G.E. Wright, per es. che la Teologia dell'Antico Testamento si poteva solo «recitare» («*Biblical Theology as a recital*» era il suo programma!). Del resto anche il von Rad sembra conoscere poco o nulla l'opera del Wright, anche se polemizzò con lui negli anni '50 nei riguardi dell'uso che delle fonti bibliche si poteva fare per la ricostruzione della storia più

antica d'Iraele. E solo conoscendo l'opera del Wright è possibile giudicare se B. S. Childs (sopra, § 8) ha afferrato o meno gli scopi ed i metodi della Teologia Biblica statunitense degli anni '40, '50 e '60.

b) Trattando della ricerca di un «centro» dell'Antico Testamento, dal quale iniziare una Teologia (sopra, § 8, Oeming p. 182 ss.) mi sembra che l'autore abbia trattato quest'argomento in forma troppo sbrigativa. L'importante, anche se poco osservato studio di S. Herrmann, «Die konstruktive Restauration — das Deuteronomium als Mitte biblischer Theologie» (FS. G. von Rad; München 1971) 155-170, viene addirittura ignorato. Per lo Herrmann il «centro» dello Antico Testamento viene visto nel Deuteronomio e nell'opera storiografica deuteronomistica, come elementi dai quali è possibile andare a ritroso come progredire. Il vantaggio di quest'impostazione mi sembra essere quello che trattiamo la Bibbia ebraica partendo da essa stessa; quali presupposti filosofici e teologici questa proposta potrebbe avere non sono finora riuscito a comprendere. È peccato che uno studio di quest'importanza venga passato sotto silenzio, mentre l'autore ne menziona altri meno importanti, qualificandoli come «*herausragend*» (p. 182, n. 3). Cade così praticamente nel nulla (alla proposta in generale sono dedicate in tutto neanche sei righe) un'opzione che l'autore di queste righe considera valida.

c) Per le Teologie di tutta la Bibbia domandiamoci infine se non esista una differenza di fondo tra il periodo *ante Christum natum* e quello *post Christum natum*. Tale differenza non va intesa, mi sembra, nel senso che la fede dell'Antico Testamento costituirebbe una religione diversa (cfr. sopra, § 6: pre-cristiana e quindi non cristiana); il problema è ben più complesso e tocca questioni quali quella dei rapporti tra la Chiesa ed Israele e quella del popolo unico o dei due popoli di Dio. Non è allora molto più prudente mantenere la divisione ormai tradizionale tra la teologia dell'Antico Testamento e quella del Nuovo Testamento?

Via Pietro Cossa, 42  
I-00193 Roma

J. Alberto SOGGIN

Howard N. WALLACE, *The Eden Narrative* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 32). 215 p. 22,2 × 14,2. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$ 16.95.

Cette thèse, défendue en 1982 à Harvard Divinity School, fut dirigée par le professeur Frank Moore Cross. L'auteur l'a légèrement remaniée en vue de la publication. Il reconnaît devoir beaucoup à deux personnalités, outre son directeur: F. Coogan et A. B. Lord. On retiendra surtout le nom de ce dernier.

Le premier chapitre propose un état de la question sur Gn 2-3. Un des principaux problèmes est celui de l'histoire du texte et de ses possibles antécédents oraux. H. N. Wallace se place dans le sillage des études de M. Parry et A. B. Lord sur l'Iliade et l'Odyssée et de F. M. Cross sur la tradition épique d'Israël. Une de leurs principales conclusions est que les œuvres tradi-

tionnelles ne sont pas le fruit d'un assemblage de petites unités préexistantes. Les longues unités sont le plus souvent originelles.

Le second chapitre traite des antécédents oraux de J. Son but est de démontrer que Gn 2-3 répond aux canons de l'*oral poetry* tels qu'ils ont été définis par M. Parry et A. B. Lord. Il envisage d'abord J dans sa totalité comme littérature traditionnelle. Par là, il entend une littérature qui se transmet de génération en génération parce qu'elle n'est pas la création d'un individu ou d'un groupe, mais la propriété d'une société ou d'une culture. Sa forme et son contenu restent stables, même si des variantes surgissent lors d'adaptations ou de réinterprétations. Elle véhicule en fin de compte la plupart des valeurs et des symboles d'une culture donnée. Reprenant alors les conclusions de F. M. Cross, H. N. Wallace affirme que les traditions J et E ont utilisé un modèle traditionnel (*pattern*) dans le récit de l'exode, de la traversée du désert et de la conquête. Il s'agit d'une combinaison de deux modèles: le dieu sort pour la bataille; le dieu rentre chez lui pour être intronisé dans son palais. La scène de la bataille se trouve en Ex 14-15. L'intronisation a lieu soit au Sinaï, soit après l'entrée dans la Terre Promise. En ce qui concerne l'histoire des patriarches, on retrouve des «motifs» traditionnels: l'épouse stérile (cf. Ugarit), le dieu des pères (Ugarit, textes amorites). Remontant plus haut encore, jusqu'aux récits des origines, les chercheurs ont depuis longtemps reconnu le caractère «traditionnel» du récit du déluge. Dernière pièce de l'argumentation: les versions parallèles d'un même récit, fait coutumier des littératures traditionnelles. L'histoire de l'épouse-sœur (Gn 12, 20 et 26) fournit un bon exemple. Dans un second temps, H. N. Wallace entend prouver que J a eu des antécédents oraux. Il s'appuie à nouveau sur F. M. Cross et sa théorie selon laquelle J et E proviendraient d'une même source épique orale du temps des Juges. J aurait été mis par écrit sous le règne de Salomon. Il doit répondre ici aux critiques faites à son maître par S. Talmon et surtout C. Conroy, «Hebrew Epic: Historical Notes and Critical Reflections», *Bib* 61 (1980) 1-30. Selon ces exégètes, il n'y aurait pas d'épopée dans la Bible parce qu'on n'y trouve nulle part, ou peu s'en faut, le reflet d'un âge héroïque. F. M. Cross a répondu en élargissant le concept d'épopée et en insistant surtout sur le style. L'épopée se caractériserait de la façon suivante: 1) par ses formules et ses thèmes; 2) par son double niveau, divin et humain; 3) elle reflète un âge considéré comme glorieux et normatif (plutôt que héroïque); 4) c'est une composition orale récitée dans les sanctuaires lors des fêtes de pèlerinage. Pour corroborer la thèse, H. N. Wallace montre que certains passages de J en Gn sont proches de la poésie et donc du style oral de l'épopée (39-43: Gn 2,4b-5; 3,3.6.14-19; 8,21; 4,2b-5a). Il faut cependant admettre qu'une longue période a dû séparer tradition orale et mise par écrit. Dernier point de ce chapitre-clé: les techniques de composition orale et J. Il reprend quelques axiomes connus de l'*oral poetry*, comme le fait que des thèmes persistent dans la tradition même au prix de certaines incohérences; les récits sont basés sur des formules, des thèmes et des scènes typiques (*type-scene*). Les thèmes sont assez flexibles, mais il tendent à la fixité.

Le troisième chapitre délimite deux «thèmes» ou «scènes typiques» en Gn 2-3: création et jardin des dieux (ou jardin d'Eden). De nombreux parallèles, surtout à Ugarit et en Mésopotamie, permettent d'étayer la thèse. Le

second thème est le plus important. Ses éléments principaux sont assez connus: jardin, montagne cosmique, source de vie, joyaux. Chaque tradition en fait un usage particulier. Le premier couple a non seulement perdu par sa faute un jardin de délices, mais la possibilité d'habiter le «jardin des dieux». Le thème a été «historicisé» en Gn 2-3. Le premier thème est moins important dans le récit biblique.

Le chapitre quatre explore d'autre éléments traditionnels du récit: l'arbre de vie et l'arbre de la connaissance. Le premier est sans parallèle extra-biblique exact, bien que les plantes et les arbres aux vertus surnaturelles soient nombreux. Les Proverbes mentionnent un arbre de vie (3,18; 11,30; 13,12; 15,4). Quant à l'arbre de la connaissance, il est tout à fait unique. H. N. Wallace s'attache surtout à la traduction et il opte finalement pour la version classique: «arbre de la connaissance du bien et du mal». Le mot *hadda'at* est un infinitif construit avec article et suivi d'un complément, ce qui est anormal mais non pas impossible. La «connaissance» ne suppose pas l'acquisition de facultés humaines, elle ne concerne pas le domaine sexuel; il s'agit de la connaissance universelle réservée à la divinité. Pour arriver à cette conclusion, l'auteur passe en revue tous les usages de l'expression et de ses variantes. Il invoque surtout Dt 1,39 et Is 7,15-16 à l'appui de sa thèse. La «faute» consiste à avoir voulu s'approprier un privilège réservé à Dieu. En ce sens, Gn 3 est proche de Gn 6,1-4 et 11,1-9. Les deux arbres ont plus d'une affinité et peut-être ont-ils une même origine dans la tradition. L'idée de sagesse est certainement sous-jacente aux deux.

Enfin, le chapitre cinq étudie le monde de la fertilité et de la sexualité en Gn 2-3. Parmi les principaux éléments traditionnels qui s'y retrouvent, retenons les liens entre Eve, le serpent et certaines divinités comme la déesse akkadienne Mami ou la déesse cananéenne Ashera (mère des vivants, associée au serpent et aux arbres; possibilité d'une même racine à la base du mot «serpent» et «vie»). Il est probable que le serpent soit en Gn comme dans le Proche-Orient ancien un symbole traditionnel de fertilité, de sagesse et d'immortalité. Le récit de Gn est sans doute polémique. Ni Eve ni le serpent n'apportent ce qu'ils promettent, mais plutôt le contraire: mort, souffrance, stérilité du sol, perte du jardin. H. N. Wallace tombe d'accord sur bien des points avec J. A. Soggin, mais il se sépare de lui sur certains détails (division du texte, original cananéen, entre autres). Il vaut mieux abandonner l'idée du *hieros gamos* à propos de Gn 2-3. Il n'est pas attesté à Ugarit et à peine en Mésopotamie. Si Gn 2-3 critique une imitation des dieux par l'activité sexuelle, idée cananéenne, cela reste à l'arrière-plan. Le sens du texte est plus large. Les conclusions ajoutent quelques éléments nouveaux à la discussion. Brièvement, l'auteur se penche sur les liens possibles entre Gn 2-3 et Ez 28; Is 14; Ps 82. Les similitudes sont évidentes, mais il faut exclure une dépendance littéraire. L'ouvrage se conclut par une bibliographie, un index des références et une table des auteurs.

Si la thèse n'est pas toujours originale dans son propos, elle a certainement le mérite de la synthèse et de l'exposé systématique. Elle tente de rassembler tout le matériel comparatif et de l'unifier à partir du concept de *type-scene*. Certes, bien des détails seront discutés par les spécialistes. Il semble que deux points surtout ne manqueront pas de soulever des questions.

Tout d'abord, la thèse centrale selon laquelle Gn 2-3 serait un récit traditionnel au sens défini par M. Parry et A. B. Lord. Les conclusions sont hésitantes à ce propos (89, 183). En quel sens peut-on parler de «récit traditionnel»? L'étude de H. N. Wallace dégage un cadre qui permet d'unifier le texte de Gn 2-3 autour de certains «thèmes». Mais ne fallait-il pas pousser l'enquête plus avant et compléter le dossier en étudiant non seulement «thèmes» et «motifs», mais aussi et peut-être avant tout le style du récit? En effet, un récit traditionnel se caractérise d'abord, semble-t-il, par son style basé sur l'usage de formules (*formulaic language*). Cf. R. Scholes-R. Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (London-Oxford-New York 1966) 20-21, 35, 50-53. Les quelques exemples de «style poétique» des p. 39-43 ne suffiront sans doute pas à emporter l'adhésion de tous les critiques. Un travail similaire a été entrepris par H.-W. Jüngling, *Richter 19 — Ein Plädoyer für das Königtum* (AnBib 84; Rome 1981) et ses conclusions sont plutôt négatives. Jg 19 serait originellement une composition écrite, non un récit oral mais par écrit (288). Il faut au moins se poser la même question à propos de Gn 2-3. Sure un autre point, la thèse aurait sans doute mérité d'être approfondie. C'est uniquement dans la conclusion que l'auteur aborde la question des liens entre Gn 2-3 et Ez 28 (et Is 14; Ps 82). Cette comparaison n'aurait-elle pas entraîné la découverte d'une autre scène typique possible, celle du mythe de la chute de l'homme primordial? Plus d'un chercheur l'a reconnue dans la trame de Gn 2-3. Cf. entre autres R. de Vaux, «Les prophètes de Baal sur le mont Carmel», *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 5 (1941) 7-20, repris dans *Bible et Orient* (Paris 1967) 485-497; P. Humbert, «Démésure et Chute dans l'Ancien Testament», (FS. W. Vischer; Montpellier 1960) 71; N. L. Habel, «Ezechiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man», *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38 (1967); L. Van den Wijngaert, «Die Sünde in der priesterlichen Flutgeschichte», *TP* 43 (1968) 35-50, surtout 43-45; N. Lohfink, «Die Ursünden in der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung», *Die Zeit Jesu* (FS. H. Schlier; [Hrsg. G. Bornkamm-K. Rahner] Freiburg 1970) 38-57; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11* (BK I,1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983) 333-337. Malgré ces lacunes, l'auteur nous fournit une source d'information de toute première valeur sur le matériel épigraphique et iconographique du Proche-Orient ancien et sur Gn 2-3. Son travail sera peut-être davantage un point de départ qu'un point d'aboutissement; cela n'enlève rien à son mérite.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

Jean Louis SKA S. J.

---

H. ENGEL, *Die Susanna-Erzählung*; Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 61). 205 p. Freiburg-Schweiz – Göttingen 1985. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

The topic of Engel's book is the story of Susanna, a story about a libel and its refutation, one of three additions to the Book of Daniel in the Greek



Bible which have no parallel in the Old Testament. The connection of the story to the book of Daniel is somewhat tenuous — the youth who saves Susanna is Daniel; besides, the story of Susanna is a separate unit which deserves independent study. The story is extant in two versions: that of the Septuagint (LXX) and that of Theodotion (Th). The two versions vary in outline, in literary form, and in point of departure; nevertheless, they are undoubtedly interrelated.

This condition of the story of Susanna raises some fundamental questions concerning its origin and development. Is the story, in one or both of its versions, a translation or an originally Greek composition? What is the relationship between the two versions: is one dependent upon the other or are both descendants of an earlier common source, either written or oral? In what milieu and to what end were the stories created? Such questions and the like that stimulate the imagination of philologists have produced many studies on Susanna.

Engel's outward justification for composing yet another comprehensive study on Susanna is the availability of papyrus 967, which forms the basis of his examination. This is the only pre-Hexaplaric Septuagintal witness to Susanna. It was first published by A. Geissen in 1968 and was not used by Ziegler in the Göttingen edition. Several works on Susanna originated later, e.g. those of Delcor (1971) and Moore (1977), but Engel has undoubtedly advanced the research on the LXX of Susanna by his consistent comments on the reading which distinguish the papyrus from the Hexaplaric manuscripts. Nevertheless, I do not believe that these readings are of essential value or actually contribute to achieving the main goal of Engel's book.

The purpose of Engel's study, as the writer defines it at the beginning of his introduction, is to discover the theological message of the older version of the story, that is, the LXX version. He argues justly that previous studies of Susanna concentrated mainly on Th's version, or more accurately that they did not discern between the two versions and made no attempt to identify the individual message of each. One wonders whether a study of such magnitude is necessary for this specific purpose. It seems to me that the definition of the story's message is only a by-product and that the study should stand on its own merit.

Engel's book is divided into four parts: the introduction (pp. 9-77); the story of Susanna according to the LXX version (78-141); Theodotion's revision of the story of Susanna (142-175); and the literary forms and the aims of both versions (175-183).

The arrangement of the book also demonstrates the above-mentioned tension between the study's purpose and its form. The two middle sections, which comprise more than half of the book, are a detailed interpretation of the two versions and set the tone of the whole book, turning it into a commentary. Therefore it is strange to find at the close of the book the small section which stands as a conclusion. Its place is in the introduction, together with the other issues which lay out the author's view of the book. As is usual with commentaries, the introduction should at the same time provide the programmatic basis of the commentary and present its results.

Engel opens his introduction (pp. 9-19) by defining his goal, which is, as

already mentioned, the discovery of the theological message of the LXX of Susanna ("Gerade bei der Herausarbeitung der theologischen Aussage insbesondere der älteren Fassung (LXX) wird der Schwerpunkt dieses Kommentars liegen", p. 9). He states that Susanna is distinguished from other stories of the same time, like Esther or Judith, by its interest in the evil within Israel: the story provides a promise of redemption for the people, personified by Susanna, if only they reject the patterns set by their corrupted leaders and turn to the word of God, though revealed through a young boy.

The idea of personification (Susanna = Judah) is for Engel the heart of the story (see also the conclusion of the book, pp. 178-179). His point of departure, apparently, is v. 22, where Susanna is referred to as ἡ Ἰουδαία, the woman of Judah (see the commentary on this verse, pp. 98-99), a name that makes her the representative of a group. To be sure, the author of Susanna, when describing his heroine's virtues and conduct, hints that he is aiming at more than simply a certain courageous woman by the name of Susanna. He calls her 'the daughter of Judah', outstanding among the daughters of Israel who submitted to the elders' malefaction (v. 57; Engel subtly associates this with Jer 29,22-23: יְעֵן עָשָׂר עָשׂוּ נְבִלָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל ... יִהְיֶה גִלּוּת יְהוּדָה). He further calls her 'the daughter of Israel', where the people is designated as 'the sons of Israel' (v. 48). Yet Susanna does not stand for the people. She is the daughter of Israel, but the sons of Israel are there beside her (v. 48); she is the daughter of Judah, but distinguished as she may be, she is still one of the daughters of Israel (v. 57). The people are there: misled and misjudged by the elders-judges who bring the evil from Babylon at the beginning of the story (see v. 5), and expelling the evil from among themselves at the end (see v. 59). And even Jacob is explicitly there, whose youths are God-beloved (v. 62a). The author could have portrayed Susanna as a model for others to imitate; yet she obviously is not at the center of his story as she would have been if she were a personification of the people. In fact the moment young Daniel appears on the scene (v. 44), Susanna retreats to the background. The conflict between the elders and Susanna becomes secondary to the contest between the elders and Daniel. Theodotion does give Susanna the principal part, but in a story of such a personal nature as his (cf. the last part of Engel's book), there is not much place for allegory.

This much concerns Engel's starting point, defined at the beginning of his introduction. Five sections follow, touching on main issues in the study of Susanna.

The first section (pp. 10-17) describes the texts used in the commentary: papyrus 967 (though preserved only partially) for the LXX version and Ziegler's edition for Th. One point developed in this section is the question of the beginning of the story in LXX. As is known, the beginning of the story in the Hexaplaric manuscripts is identical with Th's, the accepted explanation being that Origen supplemented the defective introduction of LXX with that of Th. The papyrus opens with v. 5b. Engel, following Milik, claims this to be the original beginning of the story in LXX. The papyrus' condition (the ends of the pages are damaged) leaves open the possibility that the story began at the end of the previous page. A further difficulty lies in the syntax of 5b, which is a relative clause: περὶ ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ δεσπότης. Engel draws

a parallel to 1 Cor 7,1: *περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε*, which however is not conclusive evidence because it refers to something written by the addressees of the letter; note also the use of *δέ*. (One type of heading in Jeremiah suggests itself as a partial parallel, cf. 14,1: *אשר היה דבר ה' אל ירמיהו על דברי הנביות*; 46,1: *אשר היה דבר ה' אל ירמיהו הנביא על הגוים*.) Engel is correct in pointing out that vv. 5b-6 present the story's motif and, together with v. 62a-b, provide the only clue to the meaning of the story. However, this would have been true even if some words preceded v. 5b. One last point: the question of the opening words of the LXX version is connected with the general question of the relationship between LXX and Th; v. 5b is one of the places where both versions have identical texts, meaning that one borrowed from the other's text on the Greek level. Now, provided that Th's version is the secondary one, and that he is the author of vv. 1-5a, as Engel among others would have it, it is quite strange that he composed v. 5a to fit exactly as antecedent to the relative clause found in his alleged Vorlage, LXX 5b. This does not seem to be his usual technique of revision. He either completely rewrites his Vorlage or copies it nearly verbatim. This is the case if we take Th's version to be originally Greek. If it was not, the picture is even more complicated (see below).

The second issue, dealt with on pp. 17-29, is Susanna's place in the canon. Engel thoroughly reviews the correspondence between Origen and Julius Africanus and cites their words, as well as those of Jerome, in some detail. It is certainly interesting to review the opinions of early commentators, yet it is questionable whether the large space dedicated to the patristic authors here and in the next section stands in proportion with the goal of this study, which is to understand the story from within.

Section III, pp. 29-54, presents the history of the exegesis of Susanna, starting with the patristic authors and continuing to the present time. Outstanding among modern studies are those by Brüll, who argued that Susanna was an anti-Sadducaic writing, and Baumgartner, who found combined in Susanna two well-known types of oriental popular story. Following others' contributions to the interpretation of Susanna it seems all the more important to look for the special meaning of each of the two versions considered separately, which is what Engel sets out to accomplish in this study.

Literary criticism is the subject of the fourth section, pp. 55-67. Engel gives an unequivocal answer to the question of the relationship between LXX and Th, as is stated even in the title of his book: that is, that the LXX version constituted the written Vorlage on which Th elaborated ("...dem Autor der Th-Fassung lag der LXX-text schriftlich vor"). Like his predecessors Fritzsche and Schüpphaus, he argues that Th did not necessarily have a Hebrew or Aramaic source to guide the changes which he made from the LXX version. Engel does not offer here his proof, but refers the reader to the commentary on Th with no specification of verses or pages. This means that the reader has to go through the commentary, cull out the arguments, and classify them in order to be able to evaluate the author's claims. Instead, pp. 57-64 are devoted to late traditions, in Syriac translations and in Hebrew versions of the Middle Ages, which are adaptations of Th's version. It is not quite clear why these traditions are detailed in a section concerned

with *Literarkritik*. They are meant to prove one thing: just as it does not occur to anyone that the writers of these later traditions consulted a source when changing Th, so there is no reason to assume that Theodotion had to have a Vorlage when adapting the LXX. This, of course, is no proof.

I find it difficult to believe that Theodotion did not have a Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage*. He is not just rephrasing LXX, he is making up a new story: a new opening, new scenes (including a very elaborate garden scene), and a new ending. The Hebraistic/Aramaistic patterns in those parts of Th which do not parallel the LXX, though not conclusive evidence, certainly do not contribute to the theory that Th's versions was Greek from the outset. Consider, for example, the opening verses (1-5a): why should a Greek writer with no direction from a Semitic Vorlage begin all nine sentences with καί, three of which are part of the phrase καὶ ἦν (vv. 1.4)? The same holds true in the rest of Th's version: καί opens many sentences, as is usual in Semitic languages which dwell on parataxis and unusual in Indo-European languages which favor hypotactical construction. In addition καὶ ἐγένετο, though not impossible in original Greek, is surely not expected to open four paragraphs in sequence (vv. 7.15.19.28 — all not in LXX). It seems to me that the explanation that Theodotion writes in Septuagintisms is satisfactory neither for the above example nor for many others (see Engel, e.g., on καθὼς ἐχθὲς καὶ τρίτης ἡμέρας in v. 15, which could reflect כַּתְּמוֹל שְׁלֹשָׁה, p. 157, and on the syntax of v. 19 — καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἀνέστησαν, p. 159). Engel himself repeatedly points out possible Hebrew equivalents in his commentary on Th, notwithstanding his own view on how this version originated.

The LXX version, in Engel's opinion (pp. 64-67), is an original and homogeneous work, although some older materials used by the author in composing his story can still be discerned. As for the original language, his supposition is that LXX had a Semitic source, either Hebrew or Aramaic. (He leaves open the possibility that this Semitic source was known to the writer of the LXX version only orally; however, this possibility is irrelevant because in this case the composition is still written in Greek and not in translation Greek.)

The last section of the introduction (pp. 67-77) deals with tradition and redaction in the LXX text. The outlook is interesting: the traditions introduced are all later than the LXX version, but supposing that these traditions had a rich past they could, despite their lateness, point to the kinds of sources which were available to the writer of the LXX for the motifs of his story. The question is whether the traditions detailed (following Brüll) really disclose intermediate phases between LXX-Susanna and Jer 29,21-23, the model which to some extent inspired the author of Susanna. For example, the Talmudic traditions about the two prophets who tried their luck with the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar (Sanhedrin 93b) is undoubtedly based on Jer 29, but there is hardly anything in this tradition that the author of Susanna (actually both LXX and Th) could not have learnt directly from Jer. At any rate, I have no objection to Engel's conclusion that Susanna is an altogether new work with an unprecedented combination of motives ("... eine souveräne Neukombination und -gestaltung von bisher so nicht Verbundenem").

The second part of Engel's book, devoted to the LXX versions, and the

third part, dealing with Th's revision, are each divided into three sections. First comes the Greek text, which is accompanied by a translation into German and some notes on readings in different manuscripts. Following this is a table outlining the structure of the story. The final section is the center of the whole work: the running commentary on each version.

In his commentary on the LXX version Engel constantly searches for the possible Hebrew or Aramaic roots underlying the Greek. Consequently, his main method is the clarification of Greek words and phrases, by means of dictionaries, and the search for possible Semitic equivalents, using the concordance to the Septuagint. This basic work, neglected by most commentaries except in special circumstances, is indispensable. One is grateful to Engel for not having concealed its fruit and for giving his reader the whole picture of how the relevant items are used in the Septuagint, as a basis for the philological process of discerning the translator's *Vorlage*. Sometimes, however, data are accumulated which have no real bearing on the issue: e.g. Engel notes that the phrase *οἱ παρὰ*... is customary in Maccabees and adduces a long list of references to demonstrate this (171). One reference would have served the same purpose. Besides, in Maccabees this is a technical term designating the king's escort, while in Susanna the people who surround Susanna are meant (v. 33, p. 103). Moreover, the accumulation of possible equivalents seems to have no practical end, since Engel usually does not commit himself to one or the other possibility. The reconstruction of a *Vorlage* is a delicate and difficult task which many prefer to avoid, but once set on this process, it is pointless to refrain from reaching its conclusion.

Engel does not move toward a conclusion on whether the original language was Hebrew or Aramaic; however, he suggests Aramaic equivalents only on a small scale. In addition, his search for equivalents is restricted almost exclusively to the language of the Bible, whereas the language of Susanna's *Vorlage* could have been closer to the Qumranic or Rabbinic literature.

Regretfully, the considerable efforts made by Engel in this direction have not borne fruit and he has made no significant advance toward a better knowledge of the *Vorlage* of the LXX, its Hebrew or Aramaic linguistic patterns, or its relation to a particular part of the OT (perhaps Daniel), apocrypha (I would suggest Sirach), or later literature.

Besides Engel's notes deriving from his use of the dictionary and concordance, he makes fine comments on the literary devices of the story and on possible parallels to material and motifs from the Bible and from other sources (see in v. 31 the use of Mishna Sota and other Rabbinic sources, although Engel seems to rely on secondary tools, e.g. translations, which may hinder more precise and rewarding comparisons).

The commentary on Th is similar in many ways to that on LXX. It is not as detailed, probably because the LXX version is the real interest of his study. As already mentioned, Engel makes no systematic examination of possible Semitic equivalents for Th since he is not persuaded that there existed a Semitic *Vorlage*; yet occasionally such an equivalent is ventured, if only to explain away a Semitism as a Septuagintism.

It appears obvious that the main goal of Engel's commentary on Th is to

explain it as a revision of the LXX. This means that Theodotion, as a reviser, added to, deleted from, altered or clarified the LXX version. The direction postulated by Engel seems reasonable. Still, this is not enough. As evidence, such cases should be pointed out not only in which it is likely that Th derived from LXX, but also in which it is quite sure that LXX could not have derived from Th. One minor example of such a case is v. 30, where Th has καὶ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς whereas LXX reads σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἑαυτῆς καὶ τῇ μητρὶ. It is not likely that the Hebraistic manner of expression reflected in the LXX would have emerged from οἱ γονεῖς of Th. Rather, the opposite stands to reason. In principle, just as Th could have embellished the story with pictorial scenes, LXX could have discarded elements not needed for the terse, juridic plot it aimed to present. At any rate, the relationship between the two versions is not as simple as this. If one does not accept Engel's conception of Th being composed originally in Greek, then it may well be that the story reflected in LXX is later than the story reflected in Th, yet that Th is dependent on LXX on the level of translation.

Engel's decision to present his commentaries on LXX and Th separately is in accord with his declared aim to evaluate each version as a unit in itself. However, since a commentary is atomistic by nature, and since the comparison of Th with LXX is one of the main features of this study, I would have preferred a simultaneous commentary.

In the concluding part of the book, pp. 175-183, Engel raises some interesting points of summary. The story of LXX is described as moving from the elders introduced at the beginning, through the dramatic plot, to the epilogue aggrandizing the young. Another feature emphasized in the LXX is the anonymity of the story: the protagonists, the place, and the time are not well defined. Th, on the other hand, has revised the story to be more psychological and erotic, more individual, and more historical in character. In all, the LXX story of a didactic and theological nature, which criticizes the authorities, becomes in Th a legendary story which recounts a parable with a moral of "wisdom".

These points of characterization of each version as a distinctive composition are appealing. However others of Engel's arguments, such as the aforementioned identification between Susanna and Judah, are more problematic. Setting aside Engel's general views on the essence of the stories and on their history, his book is essentially a textbook, a commentary to be consulted by those studying the story of Susanna.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Bible Department  
Jerusalem 91905  
Israel

Zipora TALSHIR

Werner STROTHMANN (Ed.), *Konkordanz zur syrischen Bibel: Die Propheten* (Göttinger Orientforschungen I. Reihe: Syriaca 25). 4 Vols. 2063 p. 24,6 × 17,4. Wiesbaden 1984. Otto Harrassowitz.

One of the basic decisions facing the compilers of this work was made easy by the fact that the complete Peshitta Old Testament has not been well served by its printed editions. From among the five editions we have, there is not much choice given when it comes to having to decide what text should be the basis of a concordance. The latest of these (Mosul, 1887-91) has no critical worth and has been discounted. Again, the first three (Paris Polyglot, 1629-45; Walton Polyglot, 1657; Samuel Lee, 1823) have in general been allowed to count as one witness since their differences are either misprints or improvements in spelling. The edition of Justin Perkins (Urmia 1852) is the only remaining contender.

The compilers have chosen the Walton specimen to represent the group to which it belongs. It, and the edition out of Urmia, are the twin bases of their work.

Although a concordance is not judged by the value of the texts it indexes, the limitations of its usefulness are defined by such a value and make it necessary to review briefly the compilers' sources.

Walton simply reprinted what was prepared for the Paris Polyglot by Gabriel Sionita, whose lack of industry and alleged carelessness did nothing to improve an edition which was based on one ms. (Codex Syriacus 6, Bibliothèque Nationale), and that an extremely poor one. The defects of this ms. make Sionita's work differ from the oldest mss. in agreeing with the MT where they disagree (and in disagreeing where they agree), in omitting clauses and sometimes lengthy passages, and in employing forms later than the classical ones. Brian Walton did nothing to emend all this, but he did include H. Thorndyke's *apparatus criticus* to the Syriac Bible in the sixth volume of his Polyglot — perhaps the only thing that makes Walton's works on the Peshitta still useful.

The use Justin Perkins made of Nestorian mss. to produce his Urmia edition resulted in something often quite different from its European predecessors. It has even been asserted that this edition's text of Psalms leaves little to be desired beyond mere conjectural emendation. However, despite the many improvements introduced into it, the edition is not wholly independent of Samuel Lee (especially where no Nestorian mss. were available), and, even where he is not being followed, suffers from the kind of imperfection characteristic of Lee's work. G. F. Moore concluded that "on the whole the text of the Urmia Bible is distinctly inferior to that of Lee and the Polyglots. The mere fact that it is based in part, at least, on manuscript authority, however, gives it a certain importance".

It is with the two printed editions just described that this concordance proceeds to work. By "die Propheten" of the title are meant not only the Former and Latter Prophets, but Daniel as well. Words are arranged according to the system used by K. Brockelmann in his "Lexicon Syriacum" (1928)

— a feature perhaps uncomfortable to many but probably not so to most who will be using the concordance frequently. Some account is taken of the variants which Walton includes in his sixth volume; the concordance has reference to these when Walton and Urmia differ.

Until better editions appear this concordance is a welcome new tool for working with what is available to date.

25, Via della Pilotta  
00187 Roma

Thomas FRANXMAN S. J.

## Varia

Marcella FARINA, *Chiesa di poveri e Chiesa dei poveri. La fondazione biblica di un tema conciliare* (Il prisma, 3 [a cura della Pontificia Facoltà di Scienze dell'Educazione "Auxilium" di Roma]) 270 p. 21 x 14,5. Roma 1985. LAS [Libreria Ateneo Salesiano]. Lit. 20.000.

"Chiesa di poveri" means a Church composed of those who have voluntarily chosen to take part in the mystery of the Savior who, in the language of Paul, "became poor", "emptied himself", "humbled himself", as an echo of the Gospel saying "meek and humble of heart". "Chiesa dei poveri" means a Church which receives the poor with the love of the Lord, not only by giving of its own possessions, but making itself a servant, accepting the invitation of the Teacher to give its life for others. So the author on her principal title (p. 264). The subtitle — "The Biblical Foundation of a Conciliar Theme" — is precise and to the point. Together these two describe exactly the contents of this excellent book which could be usefully translated into other languages.

This is not so much an original work as a compilation, a compilation based on a considerable bibliography and set out exhaustively (perhaps a bit too exhaustively) and with felicity of phrasing. Although German and English titles appear in the bibliography, French and Italian originals and translations constitute almost exclusively the content of the frequent and apposite citations. J. Dupont and S. Legasse enjoy pride of place as authorities.

The book develops according to a three-step logic (cf. pp. 7-8). The first step could well be entitled "Vatican II, the theology of its context and the theology of its aftermath" (Chapter I). It attempts a summary of the conciliar documents relevant to poverty in the context of publications on biblical-theological themes appearing between 1960 and 1980. The second step constitutes the heart of the book and consists of Chapters II-VII which explore the biblical foundation of the conciliar theme. The third step (Chapter VIII) serves as a summary and as a means of thinking through afresh the conciliar theme of poverty. It is an avowedly "provisional" conclusion because it



needs to be integrated into the history of the Church with regard to poverty, a history which the author intends to write.

This is an unabashedly derivative book. The author herself states that the six central chapters are incomplete where contemporary biblical scholarship on the subject of poverty is incomplete, and in need of deepening where contemporary scholarship is in need of deepening (p. 7). But it is nonetheless instructive for all that. It is really a crash-course in the biblical theology of "poverty". And despite whatever weaknesses it has which derive from contemporary biblical scholarship, it is moving and insightful. There is no shirking the problem of poverty as indigence which plagues and scandalizes the humans of this world. But the center of "poverty" is firmly placed in the religious dimension of openness to God. And it is the main strength of this strong book that a number of well-expressed insights cluster around this firm center:

"... Luke does not emphasize poverty for its own sake as a condition of salvation but only "Christian" poverty, that is, poverty linked to the interior attitude of humility which characterizes the most typical persons of his infancy Gospel: Simeon, Anna, and above all Mary" (p. 184).

"According to the biblical view the goods of the earth belong to God... and man is only their administrator; hence man should make use of them according to the divine will for the benefit of those who are in need. He who, in contrast to such a will, amasses them for himself... arrogates to himself in an arbitrary and atheistic manner the absolute lordship of God and thus violates the right of others..." (p. 193).

"Jesus gives the motivation of his conduct by referring it to the conduct of God; he thus stresses that the privilege of the poor and of all the privileged addressees of his message and of his salvific action is found in God, that is, in the way in which God judges and values persons" (p. 251).

Felicity of phrasing is not confined to matters of poverty. The following is as good a definition of a Gospel and of Tradition as the reviewer has yet come across: "Jesus with his existence and with his teaching rests at the center not only of the Matthean message but of the message of every New Testament author. The awareness of finding oneself before the eschatological Revealer accredited by God through the paschal event urges the primitive Church to collect not only and not so much the *vox* as the *intentio Christi*, in the form of the Gospel or of the believing Memory, in which Revelatory Event and believing reply are fused into a unity" (p. 250).

The one serious demurrer which the reviewer feels called upon to enter is occasioned by a discussion on p. 267 of the opinions of several contemporary theologians that "poverty" is not just solidarity of Jesus with human sinners but more than that his relationship with his Father. Thus in John "poverty" indicates the complete openness to and acceptance of the Father. Farina's evaluation of this view is as follows: "The Church of the New Testament knows that it must be poor as Christ was poor, not in a metaphorical way, but in a way which is very concrete, not simply stopping at the socio-economic level, but including this in the spiritual dimension of the '*anāwim*', not living detachment and shedding of material goods in a stoical way, but putting them within the finality of charity for the help of

those in need, of *all* persons in need because all are called to be children of God and brothers" (pp. 267-268). Bravo! But there is no necessary contradiction between the two positions. Finding the proper way to express Jesus' complete openness to the Father is a difficult task, and "poverty" in the New Testament sense (so well described by Farina in this book) is as good a term as any. It is not just a "metaphor" but an analogous term, with a real foundation in human experience. The vistas which this predicating "poverty" of Jesus opens up with regard not only to his relations with the Father but also with regard to his choice of the word to stress a reality central to his message are profoundly moving.

Marcella Farina is not an original scholar in the sense that she produces new insights into biblical texts; but she is original in the way in which she synthesizes and expresses the results of this original scholarship of others. And her plan of integrating the history of thought and practice in the Church with regard to poverty is exciting. May her tribe increase.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

---

Frederick James MURPHY, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation Series 78). IX-148 p. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$ 10.95.

Conduite par le Professeur J. Strugnell, conseillée par les Professeurs G. MacRae et F. M. Cross, la dissertation (Ph.D., 1984, Harvard University) de F. J. Murphy constitue une contribution appréciable à l'interprétation de l'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch (2 Baruch).

Comme le montre le ch. I<sup>er</sup>, ce travail vient à son heure. R. H. Charles avait multiplié les sources et avait négligé l'œuvre comme telle. B. Violet avait utilement lutté contre l'atomisation préconisée par Charles, mais son commentaire est relativement bref. Parmi les travaux récents, l'auteur évoque celui de A. Kolenkow (1971) dont l'argumentation pour faire dépendre 2 Baruch de 4 Esdras ne convainc pas, celui de W. Harnisch (1971), à qui il reproche d'amalgamer les théologies de 4 Esdras et de 2 Baruch ainsi que leurs structures littéraires. La thèse de A. Thompson (1977) utilise 2 Baruch surtout comme repoussoir dans l'étude de 4 Esdras, mais celle, toute récente de Gwendolyn Saylor, *Have the Promises Failed?* (1984), qui accorde une attention particulière au caractère progressif de l'œuvre consolatrice de Baruch, nous conduit tout près de l'effort plus englobant de F. J. Murphy. C'est toutefois une lacune, évoquée dans une présentation parfaitement pondérée de mon travail sur 2 Baruch (1969), qui justifie sa propre enquête. L'articulation entre la structure littéraire du livre et de ses parties, d'une part, et de sa théologie, d'autre part, y était trop rarement montrée. J'accorde ce point d'autant plus volontiers que, à l'époque, la tâche prioritaire restait celle d'exorciser 2 Baruch de l'interprétation de Charles. S'inscrivant donc dans le

prolongement de W. Harnisch, mais sans se laisser distraire par 4 Esdras, et de G. Saylor, l'auteur combine l'analyse littéraire de l'ensemble et des passages clés.

Le ch. II est consacré à l'étude de la structure d'ensemble, celle proposée par Violet (Bogaert, Thompson), mais en rattachant la lamentation (10,1-12,4) — ceci est neuf — à la deuxième section. Dès lors, chacune des sections 2 à 6 commence par une brève narration, une prière ou une lamentation, suivies d'un dialogue entre Dieu et Baruch, et s'achève par un message de Baruch au peuple. Si la deuxième section se clôt par une adresse de Dieu à Baruch, cela peut s'expliquer par la séquence des adresses finales: Dieu à Baruch (2), Baruch aux anciens (3), Baruch à son fils, à ses amis et à sept anciens (4), aux justes (5?), à tout le peuple (6) et à tout le judaïsme (lettre finale). La progression est saisissante (p. 13), mais disons tout de suite qu'elle est poussée un peu systématiquement. Le message qui achève la troisième section s'adresse au peuple et aux anciens (31,1; 32,8); la cinquième section s'achève au ch. 52 sans adresse dans le texte conservé (p. 22 et n. 11: Faut-il suivre Charles ici précisément, qui propose un déplacement?). En revanche, on s'explique bien que la première section ait un plan particulier. Et, pour la lettre, Murphy prend à son compte notre démonstration de son appartenance à l'ensemble de l'apocalypse en tant que résumé (p. 7 et 28-29). A ce stade déjà, il apparaît que la référence à Moïse et à l'alliance ainsi que la distinction radicale entre les deux mondes conduit à la relativisation du Temple et de la terre et à l'insistance sur la Loi et le monde à venir.

Le ch. III examine de plus près le schème des deux mondes (*two-world scheme*). Dans un premier temps, il distingue les points de vue de 4 Esdras, obsédé par la question de l'origine du mal, et de 2 Baruch pour qui cette question est secondaire; dans un second temps, il examine 19,6-8; 21,4-25; 44, des passages éclairant l'anthropologie (23,3-6; 42,7; 43; 48), 51 et la lettre. En conclusion apparaît la différence radicale des deux mondes, ce qui entraîne certaines complications verbales avec le gnosticisme (p. 67-70).

Le ch. IV s'attache à Sion. Il s'efforce d'abord de dégager la structure des intercessions-marchandages (*intercessory bargaining form*) en comparant la section 1 à diverses scènes bibliques et autres (Ps.-Philon, *Liber Ant. Bibl.* 12,4-10). La destruction de Sion et du Temple est plus supportable et même normale s'ils appartiennent à ce monde-ci. La nouvelle Sion ne vient pas sur terre remplacer l'ancienne (comme en 4 Esdras).

Le ch. V montre les affinités de 2 Baruch avec les structures et le style deutéronomistes. L'observation, déjà faite par O. H. Steck, est ici développée, et elle contribue à établir littérairement le parallèle entre Moïse et Baruch et à fonder l'importance de la Loi dans 2 Baruch.

La conclusion replace 2 Baruch dans le contexte historique des années 70-135, et l'auteur propose les grandes lignes de la manière dont il conçoit les rapports entre 2 Baruch, 4 Esdras et l'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Au cours du livre, il note, comme je l'avais fait, les traits qui rapprochent l'auteur de 2 Baruch et R. Joshua ben Hanania (p. 80-81 et p. 100). Je continue à croire que ce rapprochement est justifié, en dépit de l'avis de J. Neusner (*Le judaïsme à l'aube du christianisme* [Paris 1986] 154): Baruch aussi lutte contre le désespoir.

Sur l'interprétation d'ensemble, on ne peut qu'approuver. Sans s'inquiéter des sources possibles, l'auteur a dégagé la fonction de l'œuvre et le message de l'apocalypticien à son peuple. Il souligne aussi, mieux qu'on ne l'a fait jusqu'ici, la continuité de la Bible à 2 Baruch dans le style et les structures.

Faut-il insister à ce point sur la distinction et l'opposition des deux mondes comme fondement de l'entreprise de consolation? La distinction existe, c'est sûr. Il est vrai aussi que l'âge messianique est terrestre, transitoire et subordonné à une eschatologie transcendante (p. 66-67); il est mentionné toutefois et il doit jouer un rôle. Sur le point fondamental de savoir si réellement 2 Baruch maintient la Sion future exclusivement au ciel, l'interprétation de 32,1-6 est cruciale. La position consistant à y reconnaître les destructions par les Chaldéens et par les Romains est défendable (p. 104), mais elle n'est pas la seule possible, ni la plus probable (*L'apocalypse syriaque de Baruch*, t. 1 [SC 144] 424). Si les autres interprétations avaient été discutées, je serais davantage disposé à réviser mon opinion.

Il est légitime de se limiter à 2 Baruch. Un regard sur 4 Esdras est inévitable. Je suis persuadé que, pour bien comprendre l'originalité juive de ces œuvres, il faut aussi regarder vers l'Apocalypse de Jean (BETL 53 [1980] 47-68).

Dans les discussions de vocabulaire, il aurait fallu faire intervenir le grec (passage obligé ou original). Ainsi *hymnw*\*, étudié en détail p. 64-66, n'est à aucun moment donné comme la traduction de *pistis* ou d'un autre mot grec.

Sur le lien entre la structure littéraire et la théologie, l'auteur a indiscutablement apporté des éléments intéressants de méthode et des résultats. En dépit de la réserve que nous avons faite plus haut, c'est bien là l'acquis le plus solide d'un petit ouvrage qu'on lira avec profit.

Abbaye de Maredsous  
5198-Denée  
Belgique

Pierre-Maurice BOGAERT

William R. SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia — A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). xxii-305 p. 24,3 × 21,5. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Ce volume, matériellement luxueux et du meilleur goût, inaugure une série de prestige, vouée au commentaire de la Bible et de son *contorno*, série internationale et interconfessionnelle. C'est Helmut Koester qui dirige ce qui concerne le Nouveau Testament et l'*urchristliche Literatur*.

Schoedel est très avantageusement connu par ses publications concernant notamment Polycarpe et Athénagore. Le commentaire qu'il offre ici des *Letres* d'Ignace, précédé d'une introduction philologique et théologique, suivi des index nécessaires, est remarquable par sa minutie, sa richesse, sa clarté.

L'auteur connaît fort bien aussi l'Antiquité païenne et il apporte pas mal de textes parallèles, témoins d'une culture sous-jacente. On peut cependant avoir l'impression que parfois il en fait trop, y compris certains raffinements du commentaire (cf. p. 43 sur ὑπολαμβάνω; p. 52, sur les douze cordes de la cithare; p. 130, sur l'apostolicité de l'unité éphésienne...). L'essentiel reste que, si Schoedel reprend comme il se doit les acquis de l'exégèse antérieure, il enrichit beaucoup l'interprétation d'Ignace et restera longtemps, pour beaucoup d'aspects, indépassé.

Je n'en suis que plus déçu de constater que la question de la date des *Lettres* n'est pas étudiée pour elle-même et que la «solution» traditionnelle triomphe ici bien facilement.

Schoedel consacre seulement quelques lignes (p. 4-5) pour affirmer qu'après Lightfoot et Zahn, le contenu des *Lettres* se révèle compatible avec une date entre 100 et 118. Après quoi il expose les contestations actuelles, dont la mienne (*Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* [Bruxelles 1978], où j'avais rejeté totalement les thèses très différentes des deux autres, Weijenborg et Rius-Camps), admettant que mes arguments sont forts (*strong*), répétant, p. 7, qu'il n'y a rien de réellement anachronique dans les *Lettres*, ni de suffisant pour les «déloger de leur place» dans l'histoire de l'église ancienne.

Cette réfutation n'en est pas une, le raisonnement sur lequel elle repose étant inconsistant: l'argument de compatibilité ne serait fort que si la datation traditionnelle avait par ailleurs des bases solides en sa faveur, mais il n'en est rien. Je m'explique brièvement.

Lightfoot proclame que les *Lettres* d'Ignace sont une des œuvres les mieux datées et les mieux authentifiées de toute l'Antiquité si la *Lettre* de Polycarpe est (entièrement) authentique et, selon lui, elle l'est (Part II, vol. 1, p. 422), mais Schoedel, lui, éditant Polycarpe, écrit, p. 4: «The date of Polycarp's Letter can be determined then, only by reference to Ignatius». Le cercle est parfaitement vicieux. En réalité, rien ne précise la date de cette *Lettre* entre 110 et 165, date approximative du martyre de Polycarpe (et il s'agit bien d'une *Lettre*: après ma critique de la thèse Harrison de deux lettres, thèse presque universellement admise auparavant, tout le monde semble considérer ce rêve comme évanoui). Quant à la datation traditionnelle d'Ignace, elle ne repose que sur quelques mots d'Origène et ensuite sur Eusèbe. Il est clair qu'ils dépendent de Jules l'Africain et de sa liste des évêques d'Antioche, laquelle, a priori, ne saurait être plus sûre que celle des premiers évêques de Rome. Tout le monde, par ailleurs, souligne le peu d'esprit critique de ce Jules, qui a vu à Apamée les débris de l'arche de Noé. La datation traditionnelle d'Ignace ne repose que sur du sable et c'est ce que m'accordent du moins d'excellents patristiciens catholiques comme les PP. R. Gryson (*RTL* 10 [1979] 450) et Ch. Munier (*RSR* 68 [1980] 72).

Dès lors qu'on soutienne, au prix, tout de même, d'acrobaties réelles, la compatibilité du texte avec cette date ne prouve rien. Tout spécialiste peut admettre que la compatibilité avec une datation de 130, 140, 150 — et, selon moi, de 165 — serait au moins aussi démontrable, et sans doute beaucoup plus facilement.

La seule méthode est, dès lors, pour la plupart des points particuliers, d'évaluer le plus probable. En passant en revue une série de données intéres-

santes, je n'ai pas cru trouver à chaque fois, comme on semble souvent me le reprocher, un argument décisif en faveur de ma thèse mais bien mettre en évidence une solution plus probable.

Si l'on trouve chez Ignace (cf. mon *Ignace d'Antioche*, 56) une petite phrase qui se rencontre trois fois chez Hermas et qui traduit fort bien la substance même du nouveau message du *Pasteur*, alors que chez Ignace le thème reste isolé et marginal, alors que d'autres images et d'autres termes fréquents chez Hermas sont aussi dans les *Lettres*, je dis que la thèse qu'Ignace s'inspire du *Pasteur* est plus probable qu'une simple coïncidence (assez miraculeuse) ou qu'une (très hypothétique) source commune.

Si je note des termes comme ὁμιλία, πάθος, χριστιανισμός, etc., dont l'apparition ou le sens technique en 115 serait fort isolés, on me répond que nous avons perdu tant de textes que mon argument ne vaut rien. C'est faux. Il se peut que des textes perdus aient attesté ces termes très tôt, mais il se peut que non. L'objection rend seulement possible une thèse opposée à la mienne, qui est possible aussi. Et de deux possibles, il faut chercher le plus probable... Et quand la série des termes en question s'allonge, avec des recoupements sérieux dans des textes de 150 pour plusieurs d'entre eux, c'est la date de 115 qui devient moins probable.

Si je dis qu'en *Magnésiens* 8,2, la chute accidentelle de ἄδιος οὐκ est de loin plus probable qu'une addition intentionnelle, puisque l'intention correctrice ne vaudrait que pour la négation, que la version arménienne est par ailleurs très médiocre et que le texte «long» répond parfaitement à un passage antérieur 7,2..., le refus unanime qu'on m'oppose me paraît écrit avec une plume de bois. J'ajoute aujourd'hui qu'il n'y aurait aucun autre cas dans l'ensemble des *Lettres* où la version arménienne aurait raison contre tous les autres témoins directs (G, L, mais aussi g, la version interpolée, dont la paraphrase suppose un texte négatif) et que c'est une caractéristique de cette version et sans doute du modèle grec sous-jacent d'omettre assez souvent un ou plusieurs mots, lacune que par ailleurs on sait très banale si on a quelque pratique des manuscrits. Mais l'enjeu de ce passage est tel que la résistance est, aujourd'hui, totale... Le cas est semblable dans la phrase de Polycarpe, *Lettre*, 9, 1 où on voudrait croire que τοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν qualifie exclusivement un ἄλλοις sans article, acrobatie bien vaine pour éviter la conclusion qu'Ignace est de Philippes!

Si je dis, après H. Grégoire, que nous ne connaissons pas de chrétien condamné aux bêtes avant le *Martyre de Polycarpe*, on me reproche toujours d'abuser de l'argument *e silentio*. Pourtant, Ph. Mommsen, *Le droit pénal romain*, t. III, p. 263 sqq, mentionné par Schoedel, est très restrictif sur ce point et les textes antiques invoqués ne prouvent rien: Cicéron, in *Pisonem*, 36, 89 vise un abus scandaleux derrière lequel on ne peut trouver que des prisonniers de guerre, comme chez Josèphe (*Guerre juive* 7, 38 et 373). Sénèque, *Ep.* 7, 2, n'évoque que le cas de droit commun où des *latrones* sont insérés parmi les gladiateurs. Le texte le plus probant serait celui, non invoqué, de Clément de Rome, 6, 2, s'il était satisfaisant, mais sa transmission est contestée pour diverses raisons graves. Schoedel semble ignorer qu'encore en 177, il a fallu un acte du Sénat pour autoriser les organisateurs officiels des jeux à remplacer les gladiateurs par des condamnés, la mesure étant générale,

mais visant en premier lieu les Gaules (cf. Oliver et Palmer, «*Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate*», *Hesperia* 24 [1955] 320-349).

J'aimerais préciser que mon étude vise en premier lieu la datation traditionnelle. La date de 165 est une thèse que je trouve toujours plus probable, mais on démontrerait que 140 ou 150 est préférable que cela ne me chagrinerait nullement. Je tiens moins aussi à l'idée d'un faux qu'à une datation raisonnable, mais l'interpolation de la *Lettre* de Polycarpe (solution la plus probable) et les singularités du scénario des *Lettres* d'Ignace, à propos de quoi on ne me répond rien, Schoedel moins que d'autres encore, me semblent toujours l'imposer.

Ce que je reproche à Schoedel dans sa manière d'argumenter vaut pleinement aussi pour C.P.H. Bammel, «*Ignatian Problems*», *JTS* 33 (1982) 62-97, lequel conclut très ingénument: «*It is only after attempting to see him within his context that . . .*», comme si les *Lettres* avaient un contexte assuré! Cela vaut aussi pour G. Pelland, *ScEs* 32, 3 (1980) 261-297, que Schoedel ne mentionne pas. D'une façon générale, la littérature francophone est moins connue de Schoedel, qui ne fait pas état de comptes rendus d'une dizaine de pages, comme ceux de Gryson et Munier, lesquels ont des positions très différentes de la sienne.

Si j'insiste ici à peu près exclusivement sur la datation et l'authenticité, ce n'est pas seulement parce que je les conteste. Le commentaire lui-même, dans certains de ses aspects, dépend de ces questions préalables. Par exemple, ce que Schoedel conjecture de la situation de la communauté d'Antioche avant l'arrestation d'Ignace ne saurait évidemment, vu la fragilité de la construction, étayer la solution traditionnelle; ce sont plutôt de simples impressions découlant d'une conviction antérieure. Il y a une épée de Damoclès au-dessus d'une partie de ce commentaire . . .

Enfin, le fait qu'Helmut Koester est éditeur de ce volume doit être ressenti comme peu favorable à ma thèse, car Helmut Koester est un savant éminent, au sens critique aigu. Je ferais tout de même deux remarques.

Dans ses *Synoptische Ueberlieferungen*, 122 (mon *Ignace d'Antioche*, 36), H. Koester a fait jouer à plein la thèse Harrison pour pouvoir dater tout l'essentiel de la *Lettre* de Polycarpe du milieu du 2<sup>ème</sup> siècle. J'aimerais beaucoup savoir ce qu'il en pense actuellement.

Et puis, l'esprit critique peut exagérer, lui aussi. H. Koester donne parfois dans le système en abaissant excessivement la date d'une œuvre canonique (il date Luc entre 125 et 135 et les Pastorales entre 120 et 160) et en remontant généreusement la date d'œuvres apocryphes (il date beaucoup d'œuvres de Nag Hammadi du milieu du 2<sup>ème</sup> siècle, de même que les *Actes* de Pierre et de Paul). Dans cette perspective trop personnelle, la datation d'Ignace vers 100 ne lui pose pas de problème, mais j'espère qu'un jour, il dominera assez son penchant favori pour se défier de la datation traditionnelle d'Ignace.

Rue Rémy, 16  
B-6508 Carnières  
Belgique

Robert JOLY

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

---

All books and fascicles in any way connected with the biblical field sent to *Biblica* are listed here. No judgment about the book is implied by the fact of its being listed.

Further mention of the book in *Biblica* depends on the Book Review Editor's judgment. Inclusion of a book in this list neither guarantees nor precludes subsequent review.

Articles sent to *Biblica*, as well as all books and fascicles of books, are made available to the editor of the *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus* published by the Pontifical Biblical Institute. The editor of the *Elenchus* may include them or not include them in his listings as he sees fit.

All material destined for review is to be sent to: Directio *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Roma, Italy.

### Vetus Testamentum

**Ahlström**, Gösta W., *Who Were the Israelites?* x-134 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Winona Lake, IN. 1986. Eisenbrauns. \$12.50.

**Auld**, A. G., *Amos* (Old Testament Guides). 89 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1986. JSOT Press. \$3.95.

**Brownlee**, William H., *Ezekiel 1-19* (Word Biblical Commentary 28). XLII-320 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Waco, Texas 1986. Word Books Publisher.

**Clauss**, Manfred, *Geschichte Israels*. Von der Frühzeit bis zur Zerstörung Jerusalems (587 v. Chr.). 238 p. 22,3 × 14. München 1986. Verlag C.H. Beck. DM 32,—.

**Cox**, Claude E. (Ed.), *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (SBL, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 21). xv-236 p. 21,5 × 14. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press.

**Gerbrandt**, Gerald Eddie, *Kingship According to the Deuteronomistic History* (SBL, Dissertation Series 87). xv-225 p. 21,5 × 14. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press. \$12.95.

**Gonçalves**, Francolino J., *L'expédition de Sennachérib en Palestine dans la littérature Hébraïque ancienne* (Etudes bibliques, Nouvelle série 7). xi-578 p. 24,5 × 17. Paris 1986. J. Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup> Editeurs. FB 3.800.



**Hobbs, T. R.**, *2 Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary 13). XLVIII-387 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Waco, Texas 1986. Word Books.

**Holladay, William L.**, *Jeremiah 1. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*. Chapters 1-25 (Hermeneia, A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). XXII-682 p. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

*The Holy Bible. The books of Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Johan, Micah, Nahum, and Habakkuk.* Annotated Critical Translation from the original Languages by the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. Translated by Joseph Nishizu, sa and Michael Urano, OFM. VII-335 p. 21 × 15,5. Tokyo 1986. Chuo Shuppansha.

**Mathys, Hans-Peter**, *Liebe Deine Nächsten wie Dich Selbst*. Untersuchungen zum alttestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstenliebe (Lev 19,18) (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 71). XII-195 p. 23,5 × 16,3. Freiburg, Schweiz-Göttingen 1986. Universitätsverlag-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Fr.s 56.

**McCarter, P. Kyle**, *Textual Criticism*. Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible. 94 p. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

**Miller, Patrick D., Jr.**, *Interpreting the Psalms*. x-165 p. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

**Niehr, Herbert**, *Herrschen und Richten*. Die Wurzel sp̄t im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament (Forschung zur Bibel 54). XII-458 p. 23,3 × 15,3. Würzburg 1986. Echter Verlag.

**Norin, Stig I. L.**, *Sein Name Allein ist Hoch* (Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 24). 228 p. 23,3 × 16,3. Lund 1986. CWK Gleerup.

**Peters, Melvin K. H. (Ed.)**, *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*. Volume 2: Exodus (SBL, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 22). x-112. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press. \$8.95.

**Polan, G. J.**, *In the Ways of Justice Toward Salvation*. A Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 56-59 (American University Studies, Series VII Theology and Religion, Vol. 13). XIV-360 p. 22,5 × 15,5. New York-Berne-Frankfurt am Main 1986. Peter Lang. \$46.00.

**Robinson, Bernard P.**, *Israel's Mysterious God*. An Analysis of Some Old Testament Narratives. XI-93. 21 × 14,5. Newcastle upon Tyne 1986. Grevatt & Grevatt. UK £7.45.

**Syrén, Roger**, *The Blessings in the Targums*. A study on the Targumic interpretations of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33 (Acta Academiae Aboensis, ser. A Humaniora Humanistiska Vetenskaper. Socialvetenskaper och Juridik. Teologi, Vol. 64 nr 1). 259 p. 24,5 × 17,5. Åbo 1986. Åbo Akademi.

## Novum Testamentum

**Barth, Karl**, *Witness to the Word*. A Commentary on John 1. Lectures at Münster in 1925 and at Bonn in 1933. xii-163 p. 21,2 × 13,5. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1986. William B. Eerdmans. UK £8.85.

**Booth, Roger P.**, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity*. Tradition History and Legal History in Mark (JSOT, Supplement Series 13). 227 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1986. JSOT Press. \$13.50.

**Callan, Terrance**, *Forgetting the Root*. The Emergence of Christianity from Judaism. vii-131 p. 20,3 × 13,7. New York-Mahwah 1986. Paulist Press. \$5.95.

**Franco, Ettore**, *Comunione e partecipazione*. La koinônia nell'epistolario paolino (Aloisiana 20). xiii-346 p. 23,8 × 17. Brescia 1986. Morcelliana. Lit. 39.000.

**Gerhardsson, Birger**, *The Gospel Tradition* (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 15). 57 p. 23,4 × 15,1. Lund 1986. Liber.

**Hagner, D. A.**, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus*. An Analysis and Critique of Modern Jewish Study of Jesus. 341 p. 20,2 × 13,5. Grand Rapids, MI 1986. Academie Books.

**Kjærgaard, Mogens Stiller**, *Metaphor and Parable*. A Systematic Analysis of the Specific Structure and Cognitive Function of the Synoptic Similes and Parables qua Metaphors (Acta Theologica Danica, Vol. XIX). 264 p. 25,5 × 17,3. Leiden 1986. E. J. Brill.

**Lambrecht, Jan**, «*Eh bien! Moi je vous dis*». Le discours-programme de Jésus (Mt 5-7; Lc 6,20-49) (Lectio Divina 125). 265 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1986. Les Éditions du Cerf. FF 138.

**Magness, J. Lee**, *Sense and Absence*. Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel. 136 p. 21,5 × 14. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press.

**Martin, Ralph P.**, *2 Corinthians* (Word Biblical Commentary 40). LXIII-527 p. 23,5 × 16. Waco, Texas. Word Books Publisher.

**Neumann, Johannes**, *Der Galiläische Messias*. Eine Untersuchung über Leben, Wirken und Tod des historischen Jesus und den Ursprung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu (Die Entstehung des Christentums, Band I). xii-82 p. Hamburg 1986. Johannes Neumann Verlag. DM 19,80.

**Pesch, Rudolf**, *Paulus ringt um die Lebensform der Kirche*. Vier Briefe an die Gemeinde Gottes in Korinth (Herderbücherei Band 1291). 256 p. 18 × 10,5. Freiburg 1986. Verlag Herder. DM 12,90.

**Plevnik, Joseph**, *What Are They Saying About Paul?* 114 p. 20,3 × 13,4. New York-Mahwah 1986. Paulist Press. \$4.95.

**Sabourin**, Léopold, *La Christologie à partir des textes clés* (Recherches, Nouvelle série—9). 227 p. 24,1 × 16,1. Montréal-Paris 1986. Les Éditions Belarmin-Les Éditions du Cerf.

**Segalla**, Giuseppe, *Panorama letterario del Nuovo Testamento* (Leggere Oggi la Bibbia 3.6). 247 p. 21 × 13. Brescia 1986. Queriniana. Lit. 20.000.

**Stott**, John R. W., *The Cross of Christ*. 383 p. 21 × 13,3. Nottingham 1986. Inter-Varsity Press. UK £9.95.

**Thüsing**, Wilhelm, *Gott und Christus in der paulinischen Soteriologie* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 1). xxxv-307 p. 24 × 16,3. Münster 1986. Aschendorffsche. DM 48,—.

**Tuckett**, C. M., *Nag Hammadi and The Gospel Tradition*. Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library (Studies of the New Testament and its World). 194 p. 22 × 14,2. Edinburgh 1986. T.&T. Clark. UK £11.95.

**Young-Heon Lee**, Marius, *Jesus und die jüdische Autorität*. Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Mk 11,27–12,12 (Forschung zur Bibel 56). 276 p. 23,3 × 15,3. Würzburg 1986. Echter Verlag.

### Varia

**Ciola**, Nicola, *Il dibattito ecclesiologico in Italia*. Uno studio bibliografico (1963-1984). 263 p. Roma 1986. Pontificia Università Lateranense.

**Coffey**, David, *Believer, Christian, Catholic*. Three Essays in Fundamental Theology. 74 p. 20 × 13,5. Sydney 1986. Catholic Institute.

**Fisher**, Bonifatius, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibeltexte* (Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 12). 456 p. 24 × 16. Freiburg 1986. Verlag Herder.

**Fitzmyer**, Joseph A., *Scripture and Christology*. A Statement of the Biblical Commission with a Commentary. viii-110 p. 20,4 × 13,4. New York-Mahwah 1986. Paulist Press. \$6.95.

**Fuller**, R. C. – **Johnston**, L. – **Kearns**, C. (Eds.), *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. xix-1363 p. Nashville, TN 1986. Book News. \$34.95.

**Galbiati**, Enrico, *Dizionario Enciclopedico della Bibbia et del mondo biblico*. 850 p. 21,7 × 15,5. Milano 1986. Editrice Massimo sas. Lit. 56.000.

**Iggers**, Wilma, *Die Juden in Böhmen und Mähren*. Ein historisches Lesebuch. 391 p. 22,7 × 14,5. München 1986. Verlag C.H. Beck.

**Katunarich**, Sergio M., *L'Ebraismo da allora a oggi*. Spunti di storia con cenni sui suoi rapporti col cristianesimo. 325 p. 24 × 17. Milano 1986. Pubblicazioni dell'I.S.U. Lit. 20.000.

**Lavatori, Renzo**, *Lo Spirito Santo e il suo mistero*. Esperienza e teologia nel trattato «Sullo Spirito Santo» di Basilio. 187 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Città del Vaticano 1986. Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Lit. 13.000.

**Leloir, Louis**, *Écrits Apocryphes sur les Apôtres*. Traduction de l'édition Arménienne de Venise. I: Pierre, Paul, André, Jacques, Jean (Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 3). xxx-418 p. 25,5 × 16. Turnhout 1986. Brepols.

**Ménard, Jacques**, *De la gnose au manichéisme*. 105 p. 22 × 15. Paris. Cariscript.

**Meynell, Hugo A.**, *The Theology of Bernard Lonergan* (American Academy of Religion. Studies in Religion 42). xii-139 p. 23 × 15,3. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press.

**Origène**, *Homélies sur Samuel*. Édition critique, introduction, traduction et notes par Pierre et Marie-Thérèse Nautin (Sources Chrétiennes 328). 237 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Paris 1986. Les Éditions du Cerf. FF 156.

**Pearson, Birger A.**, - **Goehring, James E.**, *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Studies in Antiquity & Christianity). xxix-319 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Philadelphia, PA 1986. Fortress Press.

**Qimron, Elisha**, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies 29). 138 p. 23,5 × 15,9. Decatur, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press. \$13.95.

**Ralph, Margaret Nutting**, *"And God Said What?" An Introduction to Biblical Literary Forms for Bible Lovers*. vi-255 p. 23 × 15,5. New York-Mahwah 1986. Paulist Press. \$10.95.

**Van der Woude, A. S. (Ed.)**, *The World of the Bible*. Translated by Sierd Woudstra (Bible Handbook, Volume I). xii-400 p. 24,5 × 18,5. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1986. Wm. B. Eerdmans.

**Will, E.** - **Orrieux, C.**, *Ioudaïsmos-Hellénismos*. Essai sur le judaïsme judéen à l'époque hellénistique. 228 p. 24 × 16. Nancy 1986. Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

ISSN 0006-0887

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

---

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA  
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA